

PART of the

Abbot de VERTOT'S DISSEMINATION

Upon the Origine of the *Law of Succession*

SALICK LAWES,

AND,

The QUESTION,

Whether it be precisely in pursuance of Article LXII. Paragraph vi. That the Daughters of the Kings of France are excluded from the Succession to the Crown,

E X A M I N E D.

In FOUR PARTS.

The LAST containing a full Demonstration of King EDWARD's Right to the Crown of France, both by the very SALICK LAW, and by Precedents.

By PETER RIVIAL, One of His Majesty's Chaplains of the French Chapel at St. James's.

Done into English from the French, by a Gentleman.

DO NOT BELIEVE TOO EASTLY. [Law of the Academy deg'l Intronari, at Sienna.]

LONDON,

Printed for F. FAYRAM, at the South Entrance
of the Royal Exchange; and W. and J. INNYS, at the
West End of St. Paul's Church-Yard. MDCCXXII.

Advertisement.

THE Author, having perus'd these Sheets after they were printed off, has found the following Mistakes, *viz.* Page 51. Line 27 (which is also in the French) is to be corrected thus :

Lewis and Carloman, *Eldest Brothers of Charles the Simple, and Sons of Lewis le Begue died without Off-spring, &c.*

Page 57. in the Note, Line *antepenult.* for *in* *any other, read in any Author.*





To his Royal Highness,
G E O R G E,
 Prince of *Wales*, &c.

May it please Your ROYAL HIGHNESS,

W^ERE there any thing like Satyr in this Examination of the Dissertation published by a celebrated Author, upon the *Original of the Salick Law*, I durst not have had the Confidence to place so Great and Awful a Name, as that of Your *Royal Highness* at the Head of it: I am sensible, Sir, how distasteful a Satyrical Piece would be to a Prince, as much above the Vulgar in the Refinement of his Mind, and Greatness of Soul, as in the Splendor and Degree of his Birth and Rank.

I willingly applaud the Abbot de *Vertot's* Notions, when they appear to me Just ; and 'tis not without due Care not to infringe the Rules of Civility, that I use the Right of Criticizing upon what I think faulty in his *Diction*. I have likewise taken Occasion to animadvert upon such Errors and Mistakes as others have fall'n into ; and shewn by real Proofs how cautious we ought to be in reading even the most Reputable Authors, and most deserving the Esteem of the Publick.

These sorts of Discussions, *Sir*, are useful in their kind ; they lead to that Exactness which ought so carefully to be sought after, and help to unravel History ; at least, they teach us directly to suspend our Judgments in Matters whereof there is no certainty. Such Designs cannot displease Your R. H. who loves and encourages the Noble Arts and Sciences, and whatever else belongs to the Empire of Learning. Besides this, *Sir*, there is an Article in it self very material, and which cannot

The Epistle Dedicatory.

v

cannot but nearly concern Your Royal Highness, relating to the Pretensions of *Edward III.* to the Crown of *France*.

The Dissertation having brought me under a Necessity of speaking of them, I thought it my Duty to set them in a proper Light for two Reasons : *First*, Because most People have a wrong Notion of them, believing they are inconsistent with the *Salick Law*; whereas, 'tis upon the very Terms of that Law they are grounded. *Secondly*, Because Father *Daniel*, a famous Jesuit, hath represented them in his History of *France* as merely Chimical ; whereas, never any Pretensions were more substantial, nor better supported by Law.

One cannot, Sir, without wonder, call to Mind, after how glorious and triumphant a manner, those Pretensions were maintain'd by that King, of immortal Memory, seconded by the brave Prince of *Wales*, one of those Hero's the World will ever deservedly boast of. But what Prince *Edward* then did, under the auspicious Conduct, and after

the

the Steps of his Father, Prince GEORGE would do now under the auspicious Conduct and after the Steps of Our Great Monarch, were it necessary to support His Sacred Majesty's Right by force of Arms. Of this, the intrepid and well-temper'd Valour by which Our Prince of Wales has so early signaliz'd Himself in the Field of Battel, is a convincing Proof.

But what am I doing ? I'm sensible, the Panegyrick my Heart would lead me into, is exceedingly above my Abilities ; and tho' my Pen were capable of touching upon so delicate a Subject, the fear of offending that Virtue, which of all others is the most amiable and charming, would restrain me. Let me then conclude, by beseeching Your R. H. to pardon the Liberty I have taken in this Dedication, and vouchsafe to accept it as a Zeal-Offering, and a Proof of my being, with the most profound Respect,

S I R,

*Your Royal HIGHNESS's most Humble,
most Obedient, and most Faithful Servant,*

P. RIVALL.

Heads

Heads of the FIRST PART.

I. **T**HE Occasion and Design of the Work.
II. M. de Vertot's Complaints against
du Haillan. III. Some Discussions of
the Salick Law. IV. King Edward the Third's
Pretensions to the Crown of France, pursuant to the Sa-
lick Law, the Original Truth of which is acknowledg'd.
V. Du Haillan defended from the undeserved Censure
of M. de Vertot and Father Daniel. VI. Du
Haillan's partiality to Philip of Valois, against
Edward III. exposed. From Page I. to 35.
;

Heads of the SECOND PART.

I. **T**HE three Instances of the Salick Law produced
by M. de Vertot in the first Race, taken
from the Daughters of Childebert, Cherebert and
Gontran, revised. II. Many Particulars clear'd up,
and the Force and Weakness of the Argument drawn
from them examined. III. The Author returns to the
Salick Law. IV. Du Haillan's Defence completed,
and his Agreement with M. de Vertot and Father
Daniel, shewn. From Page 36, to 69.

Heads of the THIRD PART.

I. THE two first Examples of the Salick Law in the Third Line, in Philip the Tall and his Brother Charles the Handsome, considered. II. Many Circumstances of their History explained. From Page 70. to 100.

Heads of the FOURTH PART.

I. THE third Instance of the Salick Law in the Third Line, in favour of Philip de Valois, notwithstanding the Right of the King of England, examin'd. II. The Validity of the said King's Right shewn from the very Terms of the Salick Law. This may be called properly a Plea for Edward the Third. III. M. de Vertot's Reflections upon a Passage quoted by him out of Froissart, and which closes his Dissertation, examin'd. From Page 101 to 134.

IN the whole Book, either in tracing the Author of the Dissertation, or making some Occasional Diggessions, a great number of Facts are discussed, many Errors which Writers are fall'n into are rectified, and it is shewn with how much Caution the best Authors ought to be read; which is the Reason of placing in the Title-Page the fifth Fundamental Law of the Academy deg'l Intronati, at Sienna, Non temere credere.



PART of the
Abbot de VERTOT'S
DISSERTATION
UPON THE
Lois,
and,
Origine of the SALLICK LAWS;

AND,

This
third.
the
air-
and
ight
This

The Question, Whether it be precisely in
pursuance of the LXII. Article, Para-
graph VI. *That the Daughters of the Kings*
of France are excluded from the Succession to
the Crown, EXAMINED.

Author
ional
ma-
and
bor
the
lemy
ere.

PART I.

Friend of mine, who is equally
well acquainted with the most re-
mote Antiquity, and the Modern
State of Learning, inform'd me
in a Discourse we happen'd to
have about the *Sallick Law*, that
there was a Dissertation of the Abbot de Verot's
upon that Subject, in the Fourth Volume of the
B
Memoirs

Memoirs of Literature, taken from the Registers of the Royal Academy of Inscriptions, &c. I was extreamly pleas'd with the Discovery, being persuaded, an Author so much, and so deservedly esteemed, would give me a very great Insight into a Law, that makes so considerable a Figure amongst the Fundamental Laws of France. I perus'd it with great Eagerness ; and a few days after her my * Friend know, that the reading of it had given me a double Pleasure ; one was, that I had learn'd therein several curious Matters ; the other, that I had been confirm'd in the Notion that I had already conceiv'd of the *Sarlick Law*. I said besides, that by the way, I had made some mental Observations thereupon. No sooner had I drop't those Words, but a third Person standing by, desir'd I would put my Remarks in Writing, and publish them, making me this Compliment, that not doubting of their being good, he thought they would contribute to make the Dissertation compleat ; and assur'd me, that M. *de Verrot* was not of a Temper to be offend'd at it. However, I had much ado to resolve ; and now declare, that 'tis not without Uneasiness I take the Pen in hand.

Altho' my chief Design be, to examine certain Passages of the Dissertation, I shall not absolutely confine my self to that, but go upon other Matters, as they come in my way, or I may think them worthy the trouble of turning out of it. I do not undertake an outright Course from one End to the other ; but would imitate

* The Reverend Mr. *Maison*, a very Learned Antiquary, whom several celebrated Authors have much commended ; amongst others, the illustrious Baron of *Spanheim*.

imitate those who take short turns backwards and forwards, sometimes turning to one side, sometimes to the other, just as Occasions and Objects present themselves. A Reader may easily and without any Fatigue, *Step from Paris to Peru, from Japan to Rome.* The Business is to lead him well : And this I shall endeavour.

I do not enter upon the Dissertation, till towards the Middle of it, at Page 339. of the 4th Volume of the *Mémoirs, &c.* printed at Amsterdam in 1719. The whole contains no more than 22 Pages : So that this Examination will run only upon the 10 or 11 last. On occasion of the LXII. Chapter of the *Salick Law*, the Author mentions the Opinion of *du Haillan*, and says, " That Historian seems to intimate, the Article concerning the *Salick Law*, was intruded into the Chapter *de Alodis* by *Philip* the Tall Earl of *Poitou*; or at least, that he was the first who made use of it, to exclude his Niece the Daughter of *Lewis Hutin*, from the Succession to the Crown. Let us see, after what manner *du Haillan* doth relate a Fact of this importance, left I should be suspected of impoing upon him.

not
pon
r I
ing
ght
ould
are
ary,
men-
m,

" The most rigid Criticks upon our History, are of opinion, (says this audacious Writer,) that this Article of the *Salick Law*, was not made by King *Pharamond*, but invented by *Philip* the Tall King of France, in order to defeat, according to the ancient Custom above-mentioned, the Succession of his Niece, Daughter of *Lewis Hutin*, to the Kingdom ; who being solicited by the Earl of *Burgundy* her Uncle by the Mother's side, pretended to it : And *Philip*, to give his own Claim the " great-

" greater Authority, and this Law receiv'd by
 " the French more Credit, (*as one must always*
 " *cover that which hath not been done, or ought not*
 " *to be done, with some old Law, and some Name of*
 " *Authority,*) made the People of France, who
 " knew nothing of Letters, Histories or Titles
 " of the Antiquity of the *Francs*, believe, that
 " the Law which deprives the Daughters from
 " coming to the Crown of this Kingdom, was
 " made by *Pharamond*. Such is the Opinion of
 " this Historian.

It must be confess'd, Mr. *de Verter* is not the only one who complains of *du Haillan*: Many others have done the same before him. Father *Daniel*, in the Beginning of his Dissertation upon the Antiquity and first Author of the *Salick Law*, says, *He was always surprized at the Liberty, not to call it Rashness, with which du Haillan speaks of that Law.* However, I will venture to affirm, both of them use that Historian with too much Severity: Which is the more to be wonder'd at, because for the main they agree with him, in the most important and essential Points, as I believe I shall make appear.

That which seems, in my Opinion, to be the most ticklish and remarkable, in the Passage of *du Haillan*, is, not only the Forgery imputed to *Philip the Tall*; but chiefly that Parenthesis (*as one must always cover that which hath not been done, or ought not to be done, with some old Law, and some Name of Authority.*) This is not in his Book, entituled, *Estat des Affaires de France*, where the rest of the Passage is originally to be found, and from whence *du Haillan* did afterwards engrast it into his History of that Kingdom: Neither is it in the First Edition of the History, at

5

Upon the Salick Law, examin'd.

at least, not in the Edition of 1577, in Two Volumes in 8vo, which I make use of on this occasion : But I own, I have seen it in another of 1585, and in the last Edition of 1615. Nevertheless, if that Place be compar'd with others of the same Author, one shall easily discover, that the bold Part quoted in that Passage does not express his own Sentiments ; but the too forward Opinion of those he calls *the most rigid Critics upon the History of France*. He agrees exactly with them in one Part of their Censure ; but dissents entirely from them in that which most sensibly affects *Philip the Tall* and his Successors : I mean, the Interpolation of the Chapter *de Alodis*, and the two capital Points hinted at in the Parenthesis : One is, that before the time of *Philip the Tall*, the Daughters of the Kings of France had never been excluded from the Succession ; for this must have been the Meaning of those Words, (*that which hath not been done* :) The other is, that *Philip* ought not to have excluded his Niece, the Daughter of *Lewis Hutin* ; for the following Words (*or ought not to be done*) cannot be taken in any other sense. It will appear most evidently, the Opinion of *du Haillan* is diametrically opposite to both those Hints ; so that we are to look upon them no otherwise than a kind of Objections he brings in, as having been made by others.

Tis true, he maintain'd, that *Pharamond* was not the Author of the *Salick Law*, for limiting the Succession to the Crown of France ; and he offers to prove it this way, That *Pharamond* never set foot in the *Gauls*, but kept continually on t'other side of the *Rhine*. If this be matter of fact, 'tis a convincing Proof, *Pharamond* did not

not make that Law with a Design namely and purposely to regulate the Succession of the Crown of *France*. No doubt, but he did not make Laws for a Kingdom he was not in possession of. It would have favour'd too much of Rashness and Folly, had he made such Regulations beforehand, unless he had been endow'd in that respect with the Gift of Prophecy. But we need only suppose, he had a mind to settle the Succession, with regard to his Dominions, of what Extent soever they were then, or might be thereafter. Allowing this, it will be very reasonable to say, that his Successors having founded a Monarchy in the *Gauls*, it happened he had determin'd the Succession there, by determining in general that of his Estates, whilst they were all on the other side of the *Rhine*; as the Kings of *France* at this day, with all the reason in the World maintain the Agreement between *Francis I.* and Pope *Leo X.* ought to be of force in all the Countries since acquire'd by the Crown, as well as in those it was possess'd of at that time. See Aubery upon the Regale, Cb. 12. p. 51. and the 4th Plea of *M. Patru*.

But whatever *du Haillan's* Arguments may be, *M. de Verror* does not oppose it; nor does he care to search into the Bottom of the matter. Whether this Law, says he, immediately after he has cited the Passage of the old Historian, given by *Pharamond or Clovis*, is of no Concern. He insists only, "That the French have nothing more ancient, nor better establish'd, than the Existence and Practice of this Collection of Salick Laws; and above all, that there is no Manuscript nor printed Copy, which hath not the 62d Article, whereby the Daugh-

“ters are excluded from the Succession: A Proof
“that it has not been soitid in.” This Argu-
ment would certainly be unanswerable, if it
could be made out, that all the Manuscripts
have not been written since the time of *Lewis X.*
For those that are not of an older date, can be
of no service to clear *Philip* the Tall from the
Interpolation laid to his charge. I could have
wifh'd, M. *de Verot* had explained that Particular.
M. *Eccard*, who succeeded the famous
Baron *de Leibnits*, as Library-keeper to the King
at Hanover, has lately printed a Collection of
the *Salick* and *Ripuarian* Laws, wherein he has
published a Copy of the Salick Laws, which he
calls the * *Wolffenbuttel Copy*, and asserts to be so
ancient, that by all the tokens, it must have
been made under the Reign of King *Pepin* Fa-
ther of *Charlemagne*. In this Copy, the Article
Le Aldis is the 61st, and concludes with these
Words, which are so hard to be understood, that
M. *Eccard* does not so much as offer at any Ex-
planation: *De terra vero illâ (Salicâ) quod mulier
bæreritas est, sed ad vero exugu frater fuerat tota per-*
maneat. But I don't know, for all that, whether
one may not guess, that the Succession to the
Salick Land was by these Words reserv'd for
the Male Line; which would be sufficient to
acquit *Philip* the Tall as to the Supposition of
this Clause. But his Innocence will otherwise
sufficiently appear. I shall return in another
Place to this Point, and shew, *du Hailan* nei-
ther does, nor could impute any thing to him
than

* *Vetusissimum Exemplar Guelferbitonum nondum à Carolo M.
mondatum, ac sub Pipino, ut omnia indicio sunt, exaratum.* Prof.

on that score, without manifestly contradicting himself.

M. de Verrtot says further, “The Monk Mar-
 “culpus, who flourish'd in 660, makes express
 mention of that Law in his *Formulary*, where
 he introduces a Father speaking thus to his
 Daughter; *My dear Child, Our Ancestors es-
 blisht'd a hard and inhuman Law, which does not
 allow the Sisters to share with their Brethren in
 their Fathers and Mothers Inheritance.*” It is ea-
 sier to perceive, the Author's Design in quoting
 this Passage, was, to prove, that what we now
 call the *Salick Law*, bore the Name of a LAW,
 when this *Formula*, which must be older than
Marculphus, was written. He makes him live
 in 660, following therein the Conjecture of
 M. de Bignon; whereas others place him by a
 whole Age nearer our Times. But this is not
 what I insist upon: I stick to Two Observations:
 The first is, that the Word in the *Formula* is
Custom, and not *Law*; the second, that M. de
 Verrtot is not consistent with himself: For in the
 Dissertation before that which is now under Ex-
 amination, and which is, upon the Origine of
 the French, he does not make use of the Word
Law, but *Custom*. “My dear Child, (says a Father
 to his Daughter in the same *Formulary*,) there
 is amongst us an ancient and barbarous *Custom*,
 which excludes the Daughters from inheriting
 the Father's Estate with their Brethren. *Pag
 322.*” I pass by the Addition he has made in
 the second Translation, by saying, their *Fathers*
 and *Mother's Estate*; whereas mention is theret
 made only of the Paternal Inheritance. This
 Addition, which, I doubt not, slipt from his
 Pen, is of no consequence: But it is quite o-
 therwise

herwise with the Alteration of the Word *Cou-*
rom into that of *Law*, in the Design that is pro-
posed, when the latter is brought in. Here
follows the Original as I found it in the first E-
dition which M. *Jérôme Biganon*, since Advocate-
General in the Parliament of *Paris* publish'd at
the Age of * 23 Years, with Learned Notes of
his own.

**Lib. 2. Form. 12. Ut filia cum fratribus
in paterno succedar Alode.**

Dulcissimum filiaz meæ, illi, ille ; diuturna sed
impia inter nos *Consueto* tenetur ut de terrâ
paternâ sorores cum fratribus portionem non
habeant. Sed ego perpendens hanc impieta-
tem, sicut mihi à Domino æqualiter donati
estis filii, ita & à me sisæ æqualiter diligendi,
& de rebus post meum discessum æqualiter
gratulemini ; ideoque per hanc Epistolam, te
dulcissima filia mea, contra germanos tuos fili-
os meos illos, in omni hæreditate meâ æqualem
& legitimam esse constituo hæredem, ut tam
de Alode paternâ quam de comparato, vel
mancipiis aut præsidio nostro vel quodcumque
morientes reliquerimus, æqua lance cum filiis
meis germanis tuis dividere vel exæquare de-
beas, & in nullo penitus portionem, mino-
rem quam ipsi non accipias, sed omnia inter

* He had acquir'd a great Character many Years before by several Works all very much valu'd. At the Age of Ten, (which is prodigious) he publish'd a Descripti-
on of the Holy Land ; at Thirteen, a Treatise of the
Roman Antiquities ; another, of Law, and a Third, up-
on the manner of electing the Pope. These extraordi-
nary Performances got him the Name of the Old Young
Man.

cc vos vel dividere vel exæquare æqualiter debet
cc aris. Si quis vero & quod sequitur, p. 126.

In this *Formula* we find the Word *Consuetudo*; upon which M. *Bigon* says in his Notes, that the * Author very rightly gives the Name of *Custom* to the *Salick*, *Ribuarian*, and such like Laws, having been long receiv'd by Custom before they were reduc'd into Writing. After that, he quotes the 62d Article of the *Salick Law*. So this *Formula* may serve to prove, that when it was first made, the *Salick Law* was not yet put into Writing. The most advantageou Inference that can be drawn from hence for the *Salick Law*, is, that the Custom spoken of in the *Formula*, must be one of those ancient Customs of the *Franks*, which have been since reduc'd into Writing, in the Collection that goes by the Name of the *Salick Law* or *Salick Laws*.

But on the other hand, this *Formula* very much weakens the Authority of the Custom mentioned therein. One may gather from thence, that in the main it was an arbitrary Custom; and that if it was constantly practis'd, it was still at pleasure, and might be dispensed with, whenever it was thought proper: So that this *Custom* was not binding, except in the Case of an *Intestate*, or when the Deceased had negle-
cted to dispose of their Estates: For otherwise, how could the Author of the *Formula* suppose, that the equal Distribution he makes of his Estate between his Sons and Daughters, could

* *Consuetudinem vocat Leges Salicas, Ribuarias & similes meritorum, cum multo ante usu receptae, quam in scriptis redacte sint. Sic autem Leg. Salice Tit. 62. De terra vero Sali-
ca, &c.*

could take place against a Custom of an oblique nature; but especially, how could he have ventur'd in a publick Instrument thus to call that Custom hard and inhuman (*impia*) if it had the Force and Authority of a Law?

This Instance seems farther subject to another great Inconvenience: For one may conclude from it, That a King of France might call his Daughters to the Succession, and by that means derogate from the Custom of not admitting any but the Male Line to the Crown. So that here would be a Way for evading in favour of the Princesses of France, M. *de Verot's* Argument, which runs in these Words; "As for those who extend this Law to our Kings, and apply it to the Succession to the Crown, they maintain, that our original French Ancestors having excluded their Daughters from the Inheritance of the Salick Land, the same Law ought to comprehend the Head as well as the Members of the Commonwealth, and the Royal Family, as well as those of private Persons." May we not say, according to this way of reasoning, that as the Author of the *Formula* derogated from such a Law or Custom in the Distribution of his Estate; the Kings of France might also do the same Law regard to their Crown, since the same Law ought not to be more binding to the Head than to the Members; nor to the Royal Family, than to those of private Persons? M. *de Verot* says positively, that it was made equally for one and the other. If then private Persons had the liberty of infringing it, as appears by the *Formula* of *Marculphus*, had not Kings the same Right?

Our Author continues thus ; “ But to declare my own particular Opinion in this place, I should be inclin'd to think, that this Practice of excluding the Daughters from the Succession to the Crown, was of a longer standing than the Institution of the Law for the Sack Lands ; and even that this *Custom* was common to all the barbarous Nations which over-flow'd the *Roman Empire*, and establish'd themselves there towards the End of the Reign of *Honorius* ; *Goths*, *Gepides*, *Alans*, *Vandals*, *Hervules*, *Huns*, *Sclavonians* ; amongst which we shall not find any that were ruled by Queens.

This Opinion is unquestionably the best, but very far from being peculiar to M. *de Verdot* : Nay, 'tis that which has been longest and most universally follow'd. The Civilian *Baldus* says, that the * Daughters of the Kings of France are excluded from the Succession to the Crown by a reasonable *Custom* among the *French*. The Opinion of *Pasquier* is so very like that of M. *de Verdot*, that one would imagine he had only adopted it. “ If we look (says *Pasquier*) a little higher into History, we shall find not only the *French*, but the greatest Part of those Nations that came out of the lower Part of *Germany*, were fond of, and had a particular regard for this Law above all others.— We may almost venture to say, that it was a Law which generally obtain'd amongst the *Germans*, when they invaded the *Roman Empire*, not to suffer

* — *Filia Regis Francorum non succedit ex ratione belli Consuetudine Francorum.* Refer. Spond. ad An. 1328. §. 21.

" fer their Crown to fall to the Distaff. *Rech. de la France, L. 2. cb. 14.*

Andrew du Chesne has copied from *Pasquier* without quoting him however, in his Antiquities, and Enquiry into the Grandeur and Majeſty of the Kings of France. *L. 3. cb. 6.*
Belleforest says, that *Philip de Valois* took advantage of the Customary Law of France, and confesses, that the *Salick Law* was rather mental and traditional, than a written Law. *Grandes Annæles, Tom. 2. l. 5. initio.*

Turquet says, it was resolved, that Prince should succeed to the Crown by virtue of and according to the *Salick Law*, as many Authors think; but rather in right of Custom observed time out of mind amongst the French. *Hist. d'Esp. L. 13. p. 562.*

Spondens says, that when the Roman Law was urged in favour of *Lewis Huitin*, the Earl of Poitou pleaded the ancient Custom of France, which did not allow the Female Line to come to the Crown. *Ad an. 1316.*
Mexerai says, that then the Succession of the Male Line to the Crown was established, not by any written Law, but an inviolable Custom of the French Nation. *Abregé Tom. 2. Lewis Huitin ad finem.*

Philip de Valois, says *M. d' Larrey* in his History of England, had the Sallick Law in his favour, such a Law as it was, not written, but held by constant Tradition in favour of the Male Line, always preferr'd to the Female, which never succeeded. *Tom. 1. ad an. 1336.*

The *Salick Law*, says the anonymous Author of the Method for reading of History, is an inviolable Custom of the Monarchy of France; but

but which did not pass into a Law till the 3^d Line under the Reign of *Philip the Tall*. *Tom. 2. p. 73.*
M. Le Gendre Canon of Paris, speaking of the Faction that favour'd the Pretensions of the Daughter of *Lewis Huin* to the Throne, says, there was no Law, at least no written one, which excluded the Princesses of the Blood, and that it was only a received Custom.

I have reserved *du Haillan* for the last; because, as I have engaged, I would make out, that notwithstanding M. *de Vertor's* Design be to censure him, yet there is no difference between them upon the Matter in question. The Dissertation undertakes to refute that Historian, calling him an Audacious Writer; nevertheless 'tis plain, that *du Haillan's* Notions and those in the Dissertation are the very same. " It hath been, " saith he in his Book called *the State of the Affairs of France*, fol. 191. it hath been a Custom from observed by the barbarous Nations, that the Daughters never succeeded to their Kingdoms.— In the first Line of our ancient Kings the Crown of this Kingdom never devolved upon the Distaff; not that it was owing to the *Salick Law*, which at that time was never heard of; but to a Custom observed without Interruption amongst the Barbarous Nations, which has ever since supply'd the Place of a Law." And this he repeats Word for Word, in his History of *France*, upon *Pharamond*. *Vol. 1. p. 20, 21.*

The Instances produced by the Author are all likewise to be found in *du Haillan*, except the First taken from the History of the *Goths*. " *Theodorick*, says M. *de Vertor*, King of the Ostrogoths, who settled in *Italy* in the time

" time of Clovis the First, his * Brother in-law
" had but one Daughter; and that Princess, af-
ter the Death of the King her Father, saw
his Son *Athanarick* placed upon the Throne
of the *Goths*; and altho' a Minor, he was
prefer'd in the Succession to the Queen his
Mother, Daughter of the King deceas'd. And
the same *Athanarick* dying whilst that Princess
was yet living, *Theodatus* was acknowledged
as King to her prejudice, without the least
mention of the Daughter of the Great Theo-
dorick.

Tho' these last Lines are true in the main, 'tis
certain however, that *Amalasonia* had the Title
of Queen given her during her Regency, and
even after *Theodatus* came to the Crown, tho' in
strictness she had no right thereto. There may
be two Reasons assign'd for it: The first is, that
in former times, when Princes or great Lords
had Wards or Pupils, they usually assum'd the
Title that belong'd to the Estates of such Pupils.
This is an Observation of Father *Daniel*, spea-
king of *Philip* the Tall and *Charles* the Hand-
some; who call'd themselves Kings of *Navarre*,
with-

Custom at the
Brother-in-Law to *Clovis*. M. *Godeau* is in some doubt
about that matter in the Year 489. But when he comes
to the Year 526, he says, without any Scruple, that
Theodorick's Wife was Daughrer to *Clovis*. *Jornandes* says
the same: *Missaque Legatione ad Lodenix Francorum regem, suu-
m ejus Audeſedam ſibi in matrimonio petit, quam ille grāte
libenterque confeſſit.* De Reb. Ger. 88. init.

likely, *Jornandes*, or ſome Copift, by miſtake put *Clovis'*
Daughter instead of his Sister. For besides the Authority
of other old Historians, That King could not be Thirty
Years old when *Theodorick* married *Audeſed*. 'Tis rarely
known, that a Man at that Age has a Daughter marriage-
able.

without the least Intention however, of appropriating that Kingdom to themselves, which belonged to their Niece, *Jane* Daughter of *Lewis Martin*, whose Guardians they were. *Tom. 2.* p. 439.

The second Reason is, That anciently Kings Daughters had the Title of Queens. *Fauquet* says, that the Sons of the *Merovingian* Kings were call'd Kings, and their Daughters, Queens. This Custom was a long while observ'd in France. " This (says † *du Chesne*) may be gather'd from a Royal Charter of the Year 1245. at the time when Madam *Confiance* Daughter to *Lewis le Gros*, was married to *Raymond* Earl of *Toulouse*. For her Husband never having assum'd an higher Title than that of Earl, that Lady caused her self nevertheless ordinarily to be called Queen *Confiance*. But that Custom has been ever since out of fashion ; the imaginary Title of Queen being become the Derision and Scoff of the People.

I add, that in the *Various Letters of Cassiodorus*, one may see, that || *Theodorick's* Daughter expressed her self upon *Theodosius's* Accession to the Crown, as if out of her mere Goodness she had placed it upon his Head, and allowed him only some share in the Government. That Prince, on his part, had the Complaisance, or rather

* Of the Original of Dignities. *Cit. Ch. 6.*

† Antiq. and Enquiries of *France*, I. 3. ch. 6. p. 646. See also *de Haillan's* State of the Affairs of *France*. Fol. 198.

|| She told the Emperor, *Petraximus ad sceptra vivis regiam dignitatem aglis fraternè proximitate conjentium, qui regiam nobiscum consilii robore seffineret*. And the Senate of Rome, *Elegimus deo auxice conformat Regni nostri felicissimum Theobaldum — saltem mecum confitui Principem.* *Cass. Val. I. 10. 1. 3.*

rather the Cunning, to imitate her Stile on that occasion. Nevertheless *Procopius* introduces *A-malasonta*, when she perceiv'd her Son was near the Grave, telling *Theodosius*, That he had a Right by Birth to Theodorick's Kingdom; and also giving him to understand, that she was so far from entertaining the Thoughts of depriving him of it, that whatever Rigour she might have shewn on his account, was with a view of preventing him from hurting his Natural Right by a Conduct disagreeable to the Ostrogothic Nation. But that Princess not having a heart to lay down a Regency she had executed for eight Years with so much Credit and Success, desir'd he would by Oath promise and confirm to her the same absolute Power she had before, altho' he was to enjoy the Title of King. As Passions are blinding, she fanstid *Theodosius*, neither endow'd with the Qualifications nor Inclinations of a King, would be glad to throw the Burthen of the Government upon her; so that she alone would have the whole Management of the State. Perhaps she fed her self with those vain Hopes, by the Example of *Pulcheria*, who not only governed the Empire during the Minority of her Brother *Theodosius* the Younger; but even all his Life-time, which was near fifty Years. *Theodosius* promised and swore whatever *Amala-sonta* required of her; and then leaving her to flatter her Ambition and Vanity, suffer'd her to write in such terms to *Fufilian* and the *Roman* Senate, as she thought proper, and would do her most Honour. Nay, he out-did her; but reserved to himself nevertheless a fit Occasion, to let her know how greatly she was deceived in fancying she could be satisfied with the bare Title of King;

D

King ; which afterwards he did, as I shall have occasion to relate in an Addition I design to this Piece, and which will contain several Remarks upon the History of *Amalafonta*, too long to be inserted here, without running into an unsizable Digression.

To return to the Dissertation : The Printer has been mistaken in putting twice the Name of *Athalarick* for *Athalarick*. That Error was first made in the *Pars* Edition, and then left uncorrected in that of *Amsterdam*. One might imagine, the Person concern'd was *Athalarick*, that famous *Ostrogothic* King, a great Persecutor of the Christians, who tried Masteries so boldly with the Emperor *Valens*; and who at length being strip't of his Dominions by other *Goths*, fled to *Constantinople*, where he soon after died, delighted with the kind Reception he met with from the Great *Theodosius*: All which happened near an Age and half before the Birth of *Athalarick Amalafonta*'s Son. Mistakes that go no further than disfiguring and maiming Names, are trifles in comparison of those which may give occasion to take one Person or a Town for another.

The Instance of *Athalarick* is unquestionably of great force to make our, that the Nation which were called *Barbarous*, did not admit their Daughters to the Royalty. *Pasquier*, as well as *M. de Verter*, makes use of it to that purpose. "The *Ostrogoths* (says he, in the Chapter of his Enquiries quoted by me) reigning in Italy never receiv'd the Female Sex to the Succession of the Crown; but chose rather to be ruled by a Child than a Woman; so that the Son debarr'd the Mother. A thing easily

have
“ to be concluded from the following Exam-
“ ple : For *Theodorick* King of the *Ostrogoths*,
“ dying, left *Amalasonia*, an only Daughter,
“ who had an only Son, named *Athalarick*, a
“ Youth of no more than Ten Years old ; to
“ whom the Kingdom devolv'd, and not to his
“ Mother *Amalasonia*. Also after *Athalarick's*
“ Death, the Crown pass'd to *Theodatus* without
“ any Interruption from *Amalasonia* ; which she
“ would not tamely have suffer'd, if the Law
“ of the Country had been on her side, being
“ extremely below'd and favour'd by her Sub-
“ jects, upon account of her Father's Memory.

P. 229. *Du Chesne* has copied this Passage from
Pasquier Word for Word, p. 640.

As for *du Haillan*, he does not produce this
Instance : But I am very much mistaken, if his
Silence be without Design. He mentions *Theodo-
dorick*, whom he calls *Thierry*, *Amalasonia* and
Theodatus, in the 79th and 80th Pages of the First
Volume of this History ; but says nothing in
relation to the Right of Succession in the King-
dom of the *Ostrogoths* in *Itali*. Only in the Be-
ginning of the 79th Page he relates, that *Thierry*
left *Athalarick*, his Grandson, Son of *Amalasonia*
and *Euthalarick*, for his Successors. Now the Ex-
clusion of that Princess might have furnished
him with a strong Proof of what he advanc'd,
That it was the Custom of the Barbarous Nati-
ons never to admit the Daughters to the Crowns
of their Kingdoms. What then could be the rea-
son that he was contented with laying down
such a Proposition, without any sort of Proof to
support it, when he had so good a one at hand ?
I cannot help thinking, it was in order the
better to serve the turn of the Kings of *France* against

against the Pretensions of the Kings of *England*, since the Reign of * *Edward the Third*. In my Opinion, an *Englishman* would have much more reason to call him a dissembling partial Writer, than M. *de Vertot* had to say he was a *bold one*.

'Tis true, the Instance of *Amalasona* proves the Exclusion of the Daughters amongst the *Goths*; but the Advantage the *French* draw from thence in favour of their *Salick Law* is visibly clogg'd with a very great Prejudice; which is, that the Succession of *Athalarick* and *Theodatus*, also prove that the Exclusion of the Daughters amongst the *Goths*, did not take in that of their Sons. This is exactly what King *Edward* insist'd upon. "That young Prince (says M. *de Vertot*) claimed the Crown of *France* in right of his Mother. The *Englishman* did not directly attack the *Salick Law*, nor that ancient Custom of not admitting to the Crown any other than the Male Issue of the Reigning Family; but supposed, that being himself a Male, neither the Exclusion of the Prince his Mother, nor the very Words of the *Salick Law* could take away his Right.

The Author states *Edward's* Pretension justly enough. All judicious Writers do the same: 'Tis very proper and material to justify it. *Bodin* says, That *Edward* maintained, the Crown of

* Where were M. *de Vallement's* Thoughts, when he said, that *Edward* the Second pretended to succeed *Charles the Handsome*? One would have guessed, he meant *Edward the Third*. But by what follows, he shews, that he intended to speak of *Edward the Second*: For after having said, *Edward* pretended to succeed *Charles the Handsome*, he adds, *whose Sister he had married*.

France belonged to him, by virtue of the Salick Law well explain'd ; because altho' he was son of Isabella Sister to Charles the Handsome, he was nevertheless the next Male Kindred to that

Eng. De Reipub. lib. 6. cap. 5.

" Edward (says du Haillan) building upon the Words of the Salick Law, which say, No Female shall succeed, the next Male shall succeed, thought he had caught Philip in a Noose ; and said, the Law urged by the said Philip made for him ; for it directed, that the next Male shall succeed ; and thus affirm'd, he was the next Male, as Nephew to Charles the Handsome. State of the Affairs of France, Edl. 196.

" Edward (says Puffendorf) pleaded, that notwithstanding his Mother was excluded from the Crown on the account of her Sex, yet that could not be prejudicial to him. Introd. into Hist. Ch. 4.

" Edward (says Mezerai) readily agreed, that the Daughters could not come to the Crown, because of the Imbecillity of the Sex ; nor did he demand it for his Mother ; but main'tain'd, the Sons born of the Daughters not having that defect, were not uncapable ; and therefore he ought to be preferr'd, as being a Male, and Grandson of Philip the Handsome, & Philip de Valois, who was but Nephew to the said Philip the Handsom.

Both Parties (says Father Daniel) agreed about the Salick Law, (pray observe that Express.) " or the inviolable Custom of the Nation, that Women could not succeed to the Crown ; and for that reason the Queen of England, Itho' Sister of the last King, could have no " Pre-

" Pretensions to it : But the *English* Lawyers in
 " sisted, that the Person next of Kin, free from
 " that Defect of the Sex, had by Proximity of
 " Blood a right to succeed ; and it was upon
 " that Title *Edward* grounded his Claim, and
 " thought to exclude *Philip*." I desir'd these
 Words might be taken notice of, *Both Parties* agreed
 " about the *Salick Law*; because after reading them, one would wonder how Father *Daniel* could say as he does in his Dissertation upon
 the Antiquity and Author of the *Salick Law*,
 If the English had not been convinced of the Antiquity of that Law, they would not have failed to
 have attack'd more vigorously than they did, the
 Principle upon which *Philip de Valois*, *Title* was
 grounded. But to what purpose should they have
 attack'd a Law about which both *Edward* and
Philip were agreed ; especially since without the
 Foundation of that Law neither of these two
 Princes could have any Pretensions to the
 Crown ? It was the fundamental Principle
 both ; and surely the *English* took care not
 to attack it, since that would have been the way
 to destroy their King's Pretensions. Father *Daniel*'s Expression supposes, that in general they did not attack it ; but he brings no Proof ; nor could he produce any, unless the *English* were turned *Fool* or had a mind themselves to shew that *Edward* had no right to the Crown of *France*. This shall shew more plainly hereafter. I return
 my Quotations.

M. *le Gendre* relates, that *Edward* said, "
 Salick Law, by declaring the Females uncapable of inheriting the Crown, had not excluded their Sons ; and that their Sons ought to succeed by Representation.

To these I shall join three *English* Historians. “ According to the Laws of *France*, the Crown was to descend to the Issue Male, and no Woman could inherit the Crown. But King *Edward*, in regard that he was a Male, tho’ the Descent of the Males was interrupted by a Female, (*viz.* Queen *Isabel* his Mother) pretended, that in right the Crown of *France* was his. *Martin’s Hist. of England*, *Edw. III.* p. 107.

“ Tho’ King *Edward* himself (says Mr. *Tyrrel*) acknowledg’d the force of the *Salick Law*, whereby the Infant-Daughter of the said *Charles* was excluded ; yet the King insisted, that tho’ that Law debar’d Females from succeeding to that Crown ; yet it did not exclude the Male Heirs that descended from them. Wherefore he claimed it as next Heir-Male to his Uncle. *Hist. of England*, T. 3. p. 351.

“ Notwithstanding (says Mr. *Echard*) *Edward* acknowledge’d the *Salick Law*, which excludes not Female Inheritances ; yet maintained this Point, That the Sons of the Daughters having no such Imbecillity of Sex, were not uncapable ; and that the Peers of *France* ought to prefer him, who was a Male, and Grandchild to King *Philip the Handsome*, to *Philip of Valois*, whom they had advanced, tho’ he was but a Nephew. *Hist. of Eng. xiv Cent.* an. 1328. *Vol. I. p. 342.*

Lastly, This is what *Edward* himself explained very well through the awkward Stile of his Secretaries, in a Letter to the Pope, related by *Walsingham*. He agreed, that by a Law ever observed in *France*, Women were incapable of suc-

succeeding to the Crown, because of the Weakness of their Sex ; but insisted, that the same Reason which proved the Exclusion of the Mother, could not comprehend that of their Sons ; and consequently the Succession belonged to the next Male Heir by virtue of the same Law. Upon this Foundation he claimed the Crown of France, as being the next Male Heir of Charles the Handsome, amongst all those who descended, as Charles did from Philip the Handsome. *Wals. Hist. Ang. ad ann. 1336.* p. 137.

It appears from thence, not only that Edward did not dispute the Salick Law, insasmuch as it personally excludes the Daughters; but even that it was equally his Interest with Philip de Valois that it should be look'd upon as an irrevocable and fundamental Law of the Kingdom : For if it were not so, both would have been out of the Question ; they would have had no manner of Pretensions to the Crown, since there were actually seven Daughters of the three last Kings Lewis, Huin, Philip the Tall, and Charles the Handsome. But this Principle, common to Edward and Philip, That the Daughters of France are incapable of succeeding, being once agreed upon the whole Dispute was reduced to this Question Whether the Salick Law, or if you please, the ancient Custom, which excludes the Princesses from the Succession to the Crown, doth also exclude their Sons ; so that the Sons must be all laid aside with their Mothers, in order to come to the next of kin to the last King, from Male to Male. Philip would have it thus, Edward quite the contrary. 'To plain, the Examples of Abhalarick and Theodosius amongst the Goths, formed a strong Prepossession in his favour ; there having never been any In-

Instance against him in the French Monarchy in
a Case like his. I shall be oblig'd to resume
this Article in the latter Part of these Re-

marks.

This induces me to think, that *de Haillan*, more artful and crafty than those who have allowed'd the History of the *Goths* upon the Subject of excluding the Daughters, has said as little as he could of it; because he saw of what disadvantage it would be to the Pretensions of the Kings of France since *Charles the Handsome*, and consequently of as great service to *Edward the Third*.

and his Successors. Being lenible how great a Blow this Piece of History would give *Phi-
lip de Valois*, he took care not to make use of it to prove the Antiquity of the Exclusion of the Daughters, amongst the *barbarous Nations*: But he was likewise apprehensive, as an Historian, he might be thought to prevaricate, if he should omit to mention it amongst the Arguments made use of by *Edward III.* to support his Cause. So in his *State of France*, p. 196. he introduces him, alledging the Example of *Abbalarick*, and makes *Edward's* Embassadors do the same, in his History of the *Interregnum*, which followed the Death of *Charles the Handsome*. *Tom. 2. p.
110.* He had good reason to imagine, as the World went, that this Example coming from an English King and his Embassadors, would be far from having the same Weight with the French, as if it had been urged by an Author in the interest of *France*, altho' with a very different Design. Besides, he cunningly intrag'd this Objection, by thrusting it Head and Shoulders into a Question which was utterly foreign to the

an 1

the purpose, and which there is not any likelihood the Embassadors should mention, at least, I say, unless they were out of their Wits. He made them maintain by the Law of Nature, the Civil Law, and even by the Authority of the Scriptures, that the Female Sex ought not to be excluded from the Succession. Now, I say in my turn, this was no less than to make them go against common sense. How could they possibly uphold the Right of the Princesses of France to the Succession of the Crown, without being oblig'd to confess, that *Isabel*, King Edward's Mother, had no pretensions thereto, after the Daughters of her three Brothers, who were all before her in order of Blood? What Face could they claim the Crown of France for the Sister of the three last Kings, preferable to their *seven* Daughters? In short, it was but twelve Years before, at the Death of the young King *John*, that it was agreed and concluded, the Princesses of the Royal Blood were personally incapacitated to succeed to the Crown; which was six Years after confirm'd when *Philip* the Tall leaving no Male Issue, was succeeded without Opposition, by his Brother *Charles the Handsome*, his own *four* Daughters being excluded.

There is no Appearance then, that *ds Hailla* had any other Design in grounding the imaginary Plea of *Edward's* Embassadors upon the immediate Right of the Daughters to the Succession of the Crown of *France*, than to deceive his Readers, and make them (as far as in him lay) lose the sight of the real Point in dispute. *Ds Hailla* turn'd it in such a manner, as to make *Edward's* Pretensions appear absolutely groundless for

for two Reasons ; First, That whether by Law, properly so called, or Custom having the place of Law, the Daughters never had any personal Right to the Crown of France ; Secondly, supposing they had such a Right preferably to the Male Issue in the Collateral Line, yet could not Queen *Isabel's* Claim be admitted ; since, as I said before, and shall shew in the Third Part, there were at that time *seven* Princesses, whose Right it was to reign before *Isabel*, being all Daughters of the three last Kings, to whom *Isabel* was but *Sister*. After all, tho' *du Hailan* has made King *Edward* and his Orators produce the Instance of *Athalarick*, to prove the Exclusion of the Daughters, does not carry in it that of their Sons ; he neither makes any Answer to it himself, nor by the Earl of *Arton*, whom he furnishes with a long Speech, in reply to that which he very wrongfully puts into the Mouths of the English Embassadors. This Neglect of his seems to me very material.

After the Instance of *Amalasotta*, to verifie the Exclusion of the Female Sex from the Succession amongst the Barbarous Nations, the Dissertation goes on thus in the following Paragraph, p. 342.
As long as our *Franks* continued in *Germany*,
this Usage, which takes away all share of
Right to the Succession, from the Kings
Daughters, was probably no more than a
Custom ; but from the time of their Esta-
blishment in the *Gau's*, that Custom, like all
the rest, had the force of a Law". It were
to be wish'd, M. *de Verrior* had open'd his Mind
a little farther, and shewn us, how he thought
it came about, that that Usage having been on-
ly a Custom amongst the *Franks*, as long as they
re,

remain'd in *Germany*, changed its Nature, and with *all the rest of their Customs*, did, after they were settled in the *Gauls*, acquire the force of a *Law*, which it had not before.

For my part, I should be quite of another Opinion, that those Customs carried in them no less the force of Law amongst the *Frances* in *Germany*, than when they pass'd over into the *Gauls*. Without doubt they had Laws in their former Country. No Nation is properly so without Rules of Government, whether Ecclesiastical, Civil or Military. These Rules are truly their Laws, whether they are written or not. What then did the *Frances* do when they went into the *Gauls*? Did they reduce their Customs into Writing, and order they should thenceforward be observed as Laws; or, which is the same thing, that they should have the Virtue of Laws? Or did they perhaps, content themselves with doing it by a verbal Resolution, and at the most causing it to be published in their several Armies, and in the Countries which they had taken possession of? It may be, they did nothing of all this; but continued for some time to live after their former Usage, practising the same Customs, that is, observing in the main the same Laws.

Since 'tis plain, the barbarous Nations excluding the Daughters from the Succession to the Crown, it cannot reasonably be doubted, but that *Custum* had originally the force of a *Law* amongst the *Frances*, and even that it was one of their Laws, properly so called. M. *de Verdot* says well, p. 344. Do we not know, it is from their Customs that the *Frances* derive the First Laws which they brought with them from their Native Country? *The
Laws,*

upon the Salick Law, examin'd.

29
now, says he again, *which our Ancestors brought from beyond the Rhine.* — Now, what were those Laws? I question whether any other can be found, or shewn, than their ancient Customs. It seems to me therefore, the Author's distinction is not very exact, in not allowing the customs of the *Frances* in general, the force of laws, till they had settled in the *Gauls*.

In the Bottom he is of the same Opinion with the ancient Historian whom he censures. have said, *du Haillan* in his History of the state of *France*, relates, that the Custom of excluding the Daughters from the Crown, was always practised by the Barbarous Nations, and is ever since been received as a Law. He lays down the same thing in the very same Terms in his History; and dedicating it to King *Henry* the Third, says thus: "Methinks the *Salick Law* is of sufficient Antiquity and Reputation, having been practised as a Law from the Institution of our First Kings." 'Tis evident, he takes the *Salick Law* in its common, tho' abusive conception of that Word, meaning by it in particular, the Exclusion of Women from the Succession to the Crown; not under the Denomination of the *Salick Law*, for he maintains, the exclusion was not called by that Name, till a long time after; but consider'd in the main as a custom which served for a Law, and was generally so, and which in parcels of time got the name of *Salick*, by way of distinction.

To the Observation which I have just now examined, M. *de Verot* adds this Argument: And if the Daughters of private Families are excluded from the *Salick Lands*, and such like military Fiefs; if one may speak thus by "way

“ way of Anticipation ; because they are in
 “ capable of carrying Arms, † *quia pugnam fa-*
 “ *cere non possunt*, says Mr. Pitbou, speaking of
 “ Masculine Fiefs ; With much greater reason
 “ were Kings Daughters excluded from a Digni-
 “ tity which require a Captain and a General.
 “ And as all the Daughters of the Franks were
 “ unable either to command Armies, or to bear
 “ any share in the Fatigues of War, it was
 “ consistent with Justice, not to admit either
 “ one or the other, of what Degree soever they
 “ were, to any share of those sorts of Lands
 “ designed for Men alone, as the Price of their
 “ Blood, and Reward of their Services.” P. 342.

The Author had laid down the grounds of this Argument, by saying in the foregoing Page, that the same Law ought to comprehend the Head as well as the Members of the State, and

† This Reason, *quia pugnam facere non possunt*, brings into my Mind a pleasant Passage of Lewis Pignora; who tells us ‘‘ capacitate feminarum in successione feudalium’’ Quilibet Vasallus Dominum in pralio existentem, ‘‘ vare debet, quod mulieres non possunt, quia molles sunt ad bellum onera sustinenda, atque judicia dicenda exercenda. Honestatis justitia non patitur, ut mulier virorum sexui se immiscant, quia commixtio per culosa est ne milites propter concupiscentiam a militia divertantur. Vasallus Dominum suum consulere debet, sed varium & mutabile semper fœminum genus : illarum comitulum extremum existit, audace & ad omnia que amat vel odit fœmina, & vix pavore mulieri impossibilia invenies : secretum etiam quod tenere ignorant. His rationibus feudorum incapaces sunt ut ne testimonium quidem in eis fere possint.” I met with this Quotation in a Book entitled, *Theod. J. F. Grafinckel: J. Cti. Delphensis Dissertatione praecedentiae inter Sereniss. Venetam Rempubl. & Sereniss. Sabaudie Ducem.* P. 228. This Author confesses, *L. Pignoræ* does not do the Female Sex Justice.

the Royal as well as private Families. He refers to it in Page 344. "Why (says he) should the nature of the Salick Lands be distinguishing'd? Is not the Law equally made for one as well as the other?"

This way of Reasoning has, no doubt, something very plausible in it; but nothing that is concluding in Questions of this kind. We see in all Nations certain Customs and Laws, which have not this exact Analogy and Consistency upon which the Author builds. But let us not go out of the Bounds of *France*. Custom has not been always of equal force *between the Head and the Members of the State*. "This Law (lays *Pasquier*, speaking of the *Salick Law*) is not found always to have taken place in the Duchies and Countries, altho' they seem to be Members springing from our Crown." He proves it by several Examples, and adds, This ought to convince us, that the Article of the *Salick Law* was not always equally observ'd by *the Members and the Head of the State*. *Mezerai* tells us, that one of the Arguments produced in behalf of the Daughter of *Lewis Huitin*, was, that in great Fiefs the Daughters succeeded. *M. Le Gendre* makes her Friends speak after this manner; "Is the Kingdom of a different nature from the great Fiefs which hold of it? If Daughters have inherited *Langue doc*, *Champagne*, *Flanders*, *Normandy*, *Guienne* and *Bretany*, why should they not inherit the Kingdom?" Nay there happened something very particular at the Coronation of *Philip the Tall*, which, I am surprized he suffered, considering the Consequences that might have been drawn from it in favour of the young Princess *Jane*. *Maitilda* or *Maud*

Maud Countess of Burgundy, and Mother to the Queen, supported the Crown upon the King Head with the Peers, as being Countess of Artois in her own right. Father Daniel says, this seem'd very extraordinary, *the thing not at all agreeing with a Woman*, and being without Example. It was no less surprizing, that the same Countess * sat in Parliament in quality of a Peer, as the same Historian relates. Here then is a Woman, who in a Kingdom where Women are incapacitated to reign, fill'd Offices, and executed Duties which seem incomparable with any but the Masculine Sex. She is a Peer in her own right; she supports the King's Crown at his Coronation; she sits in Parliament. After this, let them argue as much as they please upon the Conformity of things, and that Agreement and Equality which they fansie ought to be in Kingdoms, between the Sovereign and the Subject. One may raise fine, well turn'd bright Arguments; but they will have no solid Foundation.

I say farther, that the Daughters of the Royal Blood of France have often had Appenages which pass'd to their Descendants, altho' they never had a Right to succeed to the Crown. Lastly, we see at this Day the Daughters generally

* " Even Women, whose Estates were erected into Peerdoms, or inherited them by Succession, may sit in Parliament. *Matilda*, or *Maud*, Countess of *Artois*, was summon'd, and gave her Opinion with the other Peers at the Judgment of *Robert Earl of Artois*. --- And the Duchess of *Orleance* excuses her self to *Charles V.* that " she could not be present at the Tryal of *John de Montfort Duke of Bretany*. *Duc Chéfne, Antiq. & Rech. L. Tr. 5. p. 559.*

VII. 33
upon the Salick Law, examin'd.

rally inherit their Fathers Estates. There are even some Provinces in *France*, where the † Daughters, if they happen to be born first, have better Provision made for them than their Brethren. The Quality of Heir at Law in those Places is joined, not to the Sex, but to the Order of Birth: So that the Sixth Article of the Chapter *de Alioiiis*, has been repealed by Use, in respect of private Families; whilst the old Custom of excluding the Daughters, suffis in relation to the Crown. Consequently,

the Argument under Examination, being so strongly contradicted by Experience, cannot serve for such a Conclusion as M. *de Verot* would draw from it.

A. He insists upon this, That the Kingly Office amongst the *Franks* required a Commander, and a General. From whence he concludes, 'twas both natural and just, the Female Sex should be excluded from that Dignity, being uncapable of the Command of Armies, and of undergoing the Fatigues of War. But methinks, this way of reasoning may be turn'd upon the Author: For since through a long Disuse, the Kings of *France* are no more obliged, as the First Fouders

F

* * I know (says M. *L^a Placette* in his Treatise of "Restitution, Chap. 2.) a very small Town in one of "the Provinces of *France*, where one half observes "one Custom, and the other another; the Eldest "Daughters in one carrying away the greatest Part "of the Estate from the Younger Brethren; and the "Younger Brethren in the other having the same "Advantage over the Elder Daughters". This Town, or rather Village, is in *Bigorre* and *Bearn*. The Custom of *Bigorre* is for the Eldest Daughters; that of *Bearn*, for the Sons, tho' younger than the Daughters.

ders of the Kingdom were, to head their Armies in Person ; 'tis plain, there is no longer the same reason for excluding Daughters from the Right of Succession : so that the *Cause* in this particular having ceased, the *Effect* ought to die with it. But setting aside, that the Female Sex is not absolutely unfit for War, as appears by many Instances of Women, that have, if not out-done, at least, equall'd the greatest Generals ; some Expedient might have been found. For as the Male-Children amongst the *Franks*, were admitted to the Crown in their Non-age, though they were not actually able to lead their Armies to the Field, in hopes they might one day be so ; the Daughters might have had the same Privilege, notwithstanding their Inability for War, in hopes of marrying such Husbands as might supply that defect. Nay, by this means, the Publick would reap Two great Advantages : First, the Daughters would in a few Years be in a condition to marry experienc'd Generals : And secondly, There would be a greater Certainty of having able Commanders at the Head of Armies. Who can tell what a Child's Capacity will be, when he comes to the Age of Twenty five or Thirty ? Whereas so soon as ever the Heiress to the Crown should be marriagable, they might be assured of finding a fit Husband for her, amongst such of their Generals as were qualified to command in Chief. Thus the Admission of Daughters to the Inheritance of the Crown amongst those Ancient *Franks*, would have better answer'd the Military Genius of that People, than the Exclusion of them from it. All this makes me think, we ought to quit

quit those Arguments, drawn from the nature of things, from Uniformity and Equity, and stick to such only as are grounded upon Facts: There is no other way to establish the Constitution of any Kingdom upon a sure and certain Foundation, when Matters are left undetermin'd or unexplain'd by the Laws. And M. de Verter himself comes to this in the Sequel.

The End of the FIRST PART.





PART II.



See the Author of the Dissertation
 has prov'd in the Instances of
Atbalarick and *Theodatus*, that the
 Barbarous Nations generally ex-
 cluded the Female Sex from the
 Crown; so he shews by several
 Examples taken from the History of the Kings
 of *France*, the same Custom prevailed in that
 Monarchy in particular. "Lastly, (says he im-
 mediately after) whether it be the *Salick Law*,
 " or a Custom of greater Antiquity than that
 " Law, there is not one Instance to be given
 " in our first and second Royal Families, of
 " the Daughters pretending to the Crown,
 " when their Fathers died without Male Issue.
 " We have not seen (says he again, Page 345.)
 " any of our Princesses in the two first Families
 " claim a Right to the Crown, in default of
 " Issue-Male in the House reigning." This
 Observation in the main is true: But the Ex-
 pression is not so exact; for it necessarily leads
 one to think, that Cases have happen'd as well
 in the Second as First Family of the *French*
 Kings, where the Daughters have been excluded
 from the Succession, their Fathers dying with-
 out

at Male Issue. Now this never happened. In the second Family, says *du Chesne*, no Opportunity offered for extolling the Credit of that Ancient and Noble Law." *Annot.* &c. 3: ch. 6.

It was not so with the first Line in which we have three Examples. M. *de Venet* cites em in Pages 343, 344. " Let any one ransack all our History, let him run over the Lives of *Childebert*, *Charibert*, and *Gontan*, who all left no other Children but Daughters; he will not find, that any of those Princesses made the least Pretension to the Crown. *Clerarius* the first, youngest Son of *Clotarius*, re-united the whole Monarchy under his Obedience, in 558. without any regard for the Princesses *Chrotburga* and *Chrotefunda*, his Nieces, and Daughters of his Brother *Childebert*. *zerau* tells us, the Exclusion of *Childebert's* daughters, is the first Example of the Execution of the *Salick Law*, in favour of the Male line. But Father *Daniel* (Tom. 2. col. 141.) goes higher: After having given an Account of the death of *Theobald* or *Tibald* King of *Austrasia*, who left no other Heirs than his two Great Nieces, *Childebert* and *Clotarius*; he adds this mark; " 'Tis here we see for the first time two considerable Things expressly taken notice of in History, relating to the Right of Succession to the Crown of *France*. First, That this Right was in the Royal Family of *Chloris*. Next, That no other could claim it but the Male Line." This second Article is not at all

Du Haillan, de Serres, and M. *Le Gendre* say, that *Theobald* made *Clotarius* his universal Heir. Variations in every Thing.

all to the Purpose, because *Tibald* left neither Son nor Daughter. So the Succession devolving upon his two Great Uncles, or made over to one of them by Testament, is quite out of the Question. But 'tis far otherwise with Relation to *Childebert*, as he left Daughters behind him. *Mezerai* has good reason to say, the Exclusion of them, was the first time the *Salick Law* was put in Execution to bring the Male Line to the Crown. *M. le Gendre* says the same, viz. that this was the first time the Princesses of the Blood did not inherit their Father's Crown.

Fauchet, *du Chesne*, and Father *Daniel*, all cite a Passage of *Agathias*, which gives great Weight to this Instance. This *Grecian* wrote the History of part of *Justinian's Reign*; and, as he says himself, began it when *Justin* the Younger came to the Throne, which was about the End of the Year 565. This Author, who liv'd at the same time, at the End of the Seventh Chapter of his Second Book, says thus; "Whilft these things were doing, *Tibald*, who commanded those Provinces of *France* that next to *Italy*, died in the Flower of his Youth. — *Childebert* and *Clotaressa*, as his next Kindred, were by the Laws of the Country call'd to the Succession of the Kingdom; but the Disputes that arose between them about the Partition, had like to have ruin'd their Dominions. *Childebert*, beside his extream Old Age, labour'd under an incurable Consumption. He had none but Daughters, and no Male Issue that could inherit the Crown. (Thus it is translated by M. *Confin.*) This Passage is a plain Proof, that at that time the Exclusion of the Female Sex, with Relation to

The Succession of the Crown, was look'd upon as a Law in France. Father Daniel, after having drawn this Consequence from it, observes, the French Lawyers have not fail'd to make the most of this ancient piece of History. As for the rest, the Authority of *Agathias* is sufficient to refute those who have written, that Childebert died without Children. This is what *de Serres* and *le Sueur* have done; into which Mistake they have without doubt been led by *Nich. Giles's* Chronicle. Here again the Historians differ; now is it, that there should scarce be any one point in which they all perfectly agree?

Here I shall take notice of a very material Mistake which *Moreray* has made, in the Article concerning *Agathias*, of whom I just now spoke. He says, that Author begins his History at Justinian's Death, where Procopius ended. He is derived in all Respects: First, *Procopius* wrote more of the History of *Justinian* than to the twenty sixth Year of his Reign, as *Agathias* presly mentions in the last Paragraph of his Preface. Secondly, *Agathias* was so far from writing upon the History of *Justinian's* Successors, that he never finish'd even that Emperor's; according to *Baminius*, he carries it up only to the Thirry second Year of his Reign, which continued Thirty eight. Lastly, *Agathias* says, he began writing his History about the time when *Justinian* being dead, Young *Justin* took Possession of the Empire: By this he points out, as *Moreray* conceives, the *Epocha* of the Subject. After of his History, but the Date when he sat down to write and compose it. Had he every only seen or known the Title of it, he could not have made such Blunders; for the Title

Title is, *Of the Reign of Justinian*. But he is the only One who has amus'd the World with the Detail of Books at random, and even without having so much as ever look'd into them. *Agathias* did no more than carry on *Procopius*; so that in my Opinion, it may not be amiss to set right a Passage concerning the latter, in the *Method for studing History*. It would be a great Injustice to that Anonymous Author to place him amongst those careless Writers complain of: But he has happen'd to say, that *Procopius*, whom he represents as a *Pagan*, beginn'd *His History at the Death of Honorius, and continuing to the Sixteenth Year of the Emperor Justinian that is, from the Year 408. till 554.* Tom. I. p. 16. The Name *Honorius* has drop't from his Pen, instead of *Arcadius* his Elder Brother, who die'd in 408. whereas the Death of *Honorius* was not till 423. There is besides, a Fault of the Printer, in the Figures 16. for 26. for, as have made out by the Authority of *Agathias* *Procopius's History reaches to the Twenty sixth Year of Justinian's Reign.* I must say farther that the Author of the *Method for reading History* ought not so absolutely to have said *Procopius was a Pagan*. Such as have not examin'd the Fact, will without difficulty believe and ratify it for granted upon his Word: But he cannot not be ignorant of the Variety of Opinion thereupon, and therefore 'twas fit he should at least have taken notice of that Variety. Upon the whole, I do not think he has taken the right Side. I am of Opinion with *Vossius*, that *Procopius's + Books upon Justinian's Building*

[†] Ex iis clarè elucet, hominem fuisse Christianum non Gentilem, *de Hist. Græt.*

prove clearly he was a Christian. President *Cousin* says likewise, in his Advertisement upon the first Volume of the History of *Constantinople*, that *Procopius* was a Christian, as may easily be discover'd in many Places of his Works : He quotes none of them ; but here is a very convincing one. * At that time, Jesus the Son of God was clothed with a Mortal Body, and conversed visibly with in Palestine. — He shew'd plainly he was truly the Son of God, by his Holy Life and Divine Miracles ; He rais'd the Dead out of their Graves, &c. M. *Cousin's* Translation of the War against the *Persians*, Book 2. cb. 12. § 3. To destroy the Effect of such a Passage as this, tho' no other could be produc'd, there must be something more than bare Conjectures. I know what Arguments are brought by *La Motte le Vayer*, to prove *Procopius* a Pagan ; but will be bold to say, it would be no hard matter to refute them.

There is in the History of the Daughters of *Chil-debert*, a Circumstance, in my opinion, well worth remarking ; *Merzerai* reports it thus : “ Their Uncle *Chotarius*, either out of hatred to their Father, or that they might not pretend to the Crown, kept them imprisoned, together with their Mother, till he had establish'd himself in the Kingdom”. This Precaution of *Chotarius* does not indeed prove, he had no right to succeed his Brother, who died without Male Issue ; but it may be infer'd from hence, that he did not entirely rely upon the Plainness and Justice of his Pretensions, since he back'd them with so violent a Procedure ; at least, one must con-

G

**Ἐπειδὴ τὸν ἡγέρον ἵκεντα Λυῖς ὁ τὸν Θεὸν πάντας ἀπομένων εἶπεν οὐδὲν
Διαβλῶντας εἰσενέμησεν διὰ τὸ Θεὸν πάντας αὐτὸν εἶπεν οὐδὲν εἰπεῖν.*

conclude, and 'tis what I would chiefly observe, that M. de Vertor has no reason to insist, as he does, that *Clotarius's* Nieces never made the least Claim to the Crown. It would have been better, in my Opinion, to have said, that *Childerbert's* Subjects acknowledg'd *Clotarius's* Right, by submitting peacefully to his Government, and that no one laid claim to the Succession in behalf of his Brother's Daughters: For we ought not to be surpriz'd, they did not do it by themselves, altho' they had a Right, since he detain'd them in fast Prison, and secured their Mother, lest she should cabal in their favour. It ought to be suppos'd, he did not fetthem at liberty, till they had promised not to give him any Disturbance. *Mezerat* takes notice, they never were married. 'Tis very probable, *Clotarius* forced them to renounce Marriage, and took care they should keep their Word in that particular.

Father *Daniel* says nothing of their being kept in Prison; but makes some amends, by saying, that *Chramnes* having raised another Rebellion against his Father, soon after *Childerbert's* Death, *Clotarius* banish'd his Nieces and their Mother. He imagines this was done, because the young Prince enter'd into measures with the Mother, in order to bring about a second Rebellion. His Expressions intimate, that till then, neither she nor her Daughters had received any ill Treatment from *Clotarius*. The Disgrace of the Queen (says he) Wife to the late King, who at that time was banish'd with her two Daughters, makes me conjecture, that 'twas with her the young Prince had taken measures for a Second Re-

" volt."

" volt". This Notion can never agree with that Circumstance in *Mezerai*, of *Closterius's* keeping the Mother and Daughters in Prison till he had secur'd the Kingdom. In this he follows the President *Fauchet*. " *† Closterius* (says he) having seized on the King dom and the Treasure left by his Brother, put also his Wife and Daughters into Prison". M. *le Gendre*,¹ in that part of his History published in 1700, made mention in general of their Banishment, but not a Word of their Imprisonment: But in the last Edition he speaks neither of their Banishment nor Imprisonment.

The Second Example is this: " *Cherebert* (says M. *de Verneuil*) dying in 570, left only Three Daughters; the two youngest went into a Cloyster; the eldest, whose Name was *Bertha*, married *Erhelbert*, King of Kent: And we do not find by the History of *France* or *England*, that either that Princess or her Husband ever laid Claim to the Crown of *France*". I do not believe, any substantial or considerable Objection can be made to this Example. *Giles's Chronicle* says positively, *Cherebert*, or, as he is there called *Aribert*, died without any Child. But altho' this Author had an Employment which might very well give reputation to his Chronicle, having been Secretary to *Lewis XII.* that is, as Father *Daniel* explains it in his Preface, Secretary of State; yet there is little account made of it for the first Ages of the *French Monarchy*.

The Third Example is taken from *Gontran's Will*. " This King of Burgundy (says M. de Vertor) having lost all his Sons, and but one Daughter left, nam'd *Clotilda*, appointed *Childebert* his Nephew, Son of his Brother *Sigebert*, King of *Austrasia*, his chief Heir. At the same time he bestowed a small Part of his Dominions upon *Clotarius*, second Son of his Brother *Chilperick* the First; but he left " not an Inch of Land to his Daughter".

'Tis certain, *Gontran* left his Dominions to his Nephew *Childebert*; as all the French Historiographers agree. And 'tis very surprizing, that *Baromius*, about the Year 598, should quarrel with them upon that score, pretending *Childebert* died two Years before *Gontran*. He would have been in the right, if *Gontran* had died, as he says, in 598: For he makes it very plain from St. *Gregory's Letters*, that *Childebert* died two Years before. His Mistake therefore arises from making *Gontran's* Life five Years longer than it ought to be, and placing his Death at the time I have mentioned. *Childebert* survived him above three Years: For *Fredegarius* and *Ammonius*, mentioned by † *Perau*, say, that *Childebert* died in the Fourth Year after he came to the Possession of *Gontran's* Dominions. Now *Childebert* died in 596; *Gontran* therefore must have died in 593.

That he left no Son, is what all the Historiographers agree in; but they differ concerning his Daughter: *De Serres* and *le Sueur* make him die without Children. Father *Daniel* and *M. le Gendre* say nothing on that Article. And 'tis very

very strange, *du Haillan*, who of his own head, brings the three Examples in the first Line ; and also makes the Earl of *Artois* produce them, should nevertheless say not a Word of the Daughters of *Childebert*, of *Cherebert* and *Gomar*, in the whole Course of his History. 'Tis not that I would give a Handle for any Suspicion thereupon. My Design is only to observe the Mistakes of some Historians, the Negligence of others ; but especially, the Disagreement amongst them almost in all things.

Perhaps this Expression, *without Children*, in speaking of the Kings of *France*, was made use of only to denote their leaving no Male Issue ; because no other was ever capable of the Succession. *Mezerai* must have used it in that sense, when he said of *Lewis XII.* about the Year 1514. §. 2. *As he had no Children, he brought up Francis Duke de Valois with great Tenderness and Affection ; who by the Law of the Kingdom was necessarily appointed to succeed him.* But, besides the Impropriety of this Expression, it opens the way to very great Mistakes. I know one, who happening to light upon this Passage of *Mezerai*, concluded, that the Princess *Claudia*, of whom this Historian makes mention in this very Paragraph, and whom he calls the Daughter of the Queen († *Anne of Bretany, who took Lewis XII.* for

† Father *Daniel* has observ'd, there are two Mistakes in the Chronology of the Epitaph of *Anne of Bretany*, transcribed by Father *Felibien*, in his History of the Abbey of St. *Denys*: The first is, in dating her Death Jan. 1515, which was in 1514, nay, in 1513, as they reckoned in those Days : For then the Year began on Monday in Easter-Week. But I make no question, this Fault is owing to the Copist or Printer, who, in Father *Felibien's* History, has put a 5 for a 3, as it often happens.

for her second Husband) must have been the Daughter of her first Husband *Charles VIII.* and no one can understand it otherwise, in case this Paragraph were the only Fragment remaining of the History of *Charles VIII.* and *Lewis XII.* and that it could not by any other means be known, that Princess *Claudia* was the Daughter of her second Husband, since *Mezerai* says, *he had no Children*. Those who are Lovers of Exactness, will do well to read this Passage in the Original, in order to convince themselves how necessary it is an Author should always have in his Thought that the least want of Care may be attended with the very worst Effects. Why did not *Mezerai* say, *As Lewis XII. had no Sons?* But it may be, the Fault is owing to the Copist or Printer.

The Epitaph is set down, as it ought to be in this Particular, in Father *Germain Miller's* Book, call'd *Le Trés Sacré de St. Denis*. The second Mistake, continues Father *Daniel*, is, that 'tis there said *Anne* died the Twentieth of *January*, whereas it was on the Nineteenth: This second Error is real. The Epitaph its self proves it which bares Date *Anno Salutis 1513. die Lunae 20 Januarii obiit. &c.* If one examines what Day the Year 1513 began upon, 'twill appear to have been on a Sunday, so the Twentieth could not be a Monday, where it were to be wish'd, Historians would set down the Day of the Week as well as the Days of the Month, when they are able. This Epitaph demonstrates, that *Mezerai*, M. *Briantville*, *Morery*, Father *Daniel*, and M. *le Gendre*, where all mistaken in saying, *Anne* had two Sons by *Lewis XII.* one may see there she had but one. The two last of these Historians tell us, she had only two Daughters by him. Indeed she left but Two; but she had Three. *Cui Regis Ludovico XII.) cùm tres filias & filium unum pereisset, via pro dolor! excepit, duabus tantum filiabis superfluitibus, filium D. Claudia & Renata.*

But the chief Observation I would make upon the third Instance of the Daughters being excluded in the first Line, is, that it is not of so much force as at first it seems to be, because of this Circumstance in *Mezeraï*, that *Gontran's* Daughter went into a Convent in her Father's Life-time : *He left only a Daughter named Clotilda, who had taken the Vail.* Can it not be supposed M. de Vertot perceived this Defect, and if I may be allow'd to Pun, for that Reason drew a Vail over that of the Princesses ? He has observ'd, that of *Cherebert's* three Daughters the two youngest put on the Vail. He might have said as much of *Gontran's* Daughter, with this Difference, that *Mezeraï's* Expression leaves it doubtful, whether they turned *Nuns* in their Father's Life-time, or after his Death ; whereas speaking of *Gontran's* Daughter, he says plainly, that she had already put on the Vail in her Father's Life-time. Now it may be her turning *Nun* was enough to incapacitate her for the Succession, or at least gave a Pretence to exclude her, supposing her Sex had not. *Mezeraï* tells us, *Pepis* caused his Nephews, the Sons of *Carloman*, to be shaven, that they might never make any Claim to their Father's Dominions. *Tom. I. p. 214. Ed. de Hol.*

It was, perhaps, in the same View that *Cherebert*, and *Clotarius* the Son of *Clodomir*, having secured their Brother *Clodomir's* three Children, desired their own Mother *Clotilda*, who was Grandmother to the three young Princes, and had the Care of their Education, to give her Consent they should be shaven, threatening otherwise to put them to Death : This is what they gave her to understand, by sending her a naked Sword with a Pair of Scissars ; upon which, in

in the Extremity of Grief, she cried out, *that she had rather see them dead than shaven.* I know not whether *Childeris* and *Clotarius's* Intention by cutting off their Hair, was to make them Monks, (which is very likely), or to lop them from the Royal Family of *France*, which distinguished its self by long Hair. Hence it was that *Clodomir* being kill'd in a Battle with the *Burgundians*, in which nevertheless he had the Victory, † was discovered of the Enemy by his long Hair : “ Because, says *du Hillian*, no Body else in *France*, but the Kings and Princes of the Blood wore long Hair. However that be, the Abbor St. *Real*, towards the End of the Fifth Discourse in his Book upon the Use of History, is very much mistaken in the meaning of *Clotilda's* Exclamation, by supposing she had really preferred her Grandchildrens Hair before the safety of their Lives, which of all Extravagancies would have been the greatest : Whereas her meaning was (as Father *Daniel* has explained it) *that she chose rather to see them dead, than reduced to the Condition of Subjects*; 'tis thus this Historian makes her speak. M. *Bernard* has very well handled this Mistake made by M. *de St. Real* in his *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres du Mois de Juin 1701*. Yet there is another in the History

† Father *Daniel* says, whilst *Clodomir* was pursuing the Runaways, he found himself engaged with them, having scarce any one of his own People to attend him; and having halted, in Expectation that some of his Party would come to his Assistance, was discover'd by the *Burgundians*, who knowing that Prince by his long Hair, made a Signal to him, as if they had been *Frenchmen*, upon which he advanced towards them, and as soon as he came near, was run through in several Places, and kill'd upon the Spot. T. I. col. 67.

story which he has not observed, but fallen into the same himself. This Abbot does not name *Clotilda*, but by way of Indication, calls her *this Mother of the first Line of our Kings*. But he says, the three young Princes of whom we treat were *her Children*; and M. *Bernard* himself says, *they were Clotilda's Children by Clodomir*. They did not consider, that Princess was St. *Clotilda*, Wife of *Clavis*, Mother of *Clodomir* King of *Orleans*, *Childebert* King of *Paris*, and *Clotarius* King of *Soiffons*, who at length came to inherit the whole *French Monarchy*: So she was Grandmother to *Clodomir's* three Children. *Du Haillan* calls their Mother *Goldeak*, and *Mezerai*, *Gondioche*. She married her Brother-in-law *Clotarius*, whilst he had another Wife, soon after he had murder'd two of his own Children; and the third had likewise fallen a Sacrifice to his Cruelty, if they had not prevented it by putting him out of his Way. “ He resolved (says Father *Daniel*) to be shaven, and to go into Holy Orders, as soon as he was of Age. ’Tis his Name, though very much disguised, the Church and Village of *St. Glos* near *Paris* bears at this time, where he lies interr'd, and highly honour'd. Happy in having never been a King, since by that means he became a Saint. *Tom. I. col. 48.*

At last, M. *de Verre* assures us, *Gontran did not leave an Inch of Land to his Daughter*. I find, however, the contrary in a very valuable Author, that is, President *Fauquier*; after having said that *Gontran*, who died without Male Issue, had in his Life-time appointed *Childebert* King of *Austrasia*, his Brother's Son, King over the *French* in *Burgundy*, in a full Assembly of the Nobles of the

the said Kingdom, he adds, " And yet one can.
 " not say, that by this Donation he disregarded
 " his Daughter, since by an Agreement with
 " his said Nephew, he settled *a large portion* of
 " Land upon her ; thereby shewing the great
 " and paternal Affection he had for her. *De l'O.*
rigeine des Dignitez. cb. 2.

These Instances in the first Line, make too considerable a Figure in the *French History*, for us not to wonder *Pasquier* should take no notice of 'em ; which if he had, he would not have said, " The Luck of the Times had been such from all Antiquity, as never to suffer (at least as I can find plainly express'd in our Histories) the Crown to be without Male Issue in a direct Line, except since the Death of *Lewis* " *Hutin.*" *Rech. l. 2. c. 14.* What a Mistake is this, for a Man of *Pasquier's* Character, Author of the *Recherches de la France*, in which there are so many good Things ? Who could not have depended upon him for Truth ? For who could imagine he would venture to write this designedly, without having first well examin'd it, especially when one reads this Parenthesis [at least as I can find plainly express'd in our Histories ?] Was it possible for him to look into them, and not see abundance of Collateral Successions before the Death of *Lewis Hutin* ? There are no less than Six Examples in the *Merovingian Line* alone, reckoning with *Mezerai* no more than Twenty one Kings ; and there will be *Seven*, if *Clotarius* the Fourth be inserted for the Nineteenth King, as some allow. Let me set them down according to *Mezerai's Chronology.*

I. *Childebert I.* The Sixth King, died without Male Issue, and was succeeded by his Brother *Clotarius* in 558.

2. *Cherebert or Charibert*, the Eighth King, died also without Male Issue, and was succeeded by his Three Brethren, in 570.

3. *Clotarius III.* the Thirteenth King, died without Children. *Thierry*, his younger Brother, got into the Throne ; but was soon dispossess'd of it by his Elder Brother, *Childeric II.* in 669.

4. The same *Childeric*, the Fourteenth King, being kill'd together with his Son ; after an Interregnum of some Months, *Thierry* was taken out of the Monastery of St. *Dennis*, to which his Brother had confined him, and re-placed upon the Throne in 673.

5. *Clavis III.* the Sixteenth King, died without Children, and was succeeded by his Brother

Childeric II. in 695.

6. *Childeric II.* the Nineteenth King, died also without Children, and *Thierry II.* called *the Chelles*, Son of *Dagobert II.* succeeded him in 721. If *Clotarius IV.* be admitted into the List of Kings, he will be a Seventh Example to demonstrate how egregiously the Famous *Pasquier* was mistaken.

As for the second Line, *Lewis, Carlonian and Sordet* [at the bottom] and *Charles the Simple*, all Sons of *Lewis le Begue*, died without Off-spring ; so also did *Lewis V.* last King of the *Carolingian* Race. And the number of Collateral Successions would swell very much, if we were to examine the Series of the Kings of *Metz, Soissons, Orleans, and Chalons*. But I have inserted none in my List, except such as have been Kings of all *France*, or *Paris* in particular. This is the Reason I have said

said nothing of the Daughter of *Gontran*, King of *Burgundy*, who is the last Example of the three historical Proofs in the First Line, made use of by M. *de Vertot*, to justify the ancient Practice of the *Salick Law*, in relation to the Crown of *France*.

These three are the only Examples can be found till the Successor of young King *John*, Son of *Louis Hatin*. Many Authors have produced them ; as, ¹ *Bodin*, ² *Faucher*, ³ *Chefne*, ⁴ *de Serres*, and *du Haillan*. This last mentions both of them in his History, and in his *State of the Affairs of France* ; in which, after having said, as I have related, That it was a Custom amongst the barbarous Nations, not to admit the Daughters to the Succession of their Kingdoms, he adds, " And altho' during the Times of † Paganism, as well as since the Introduction of Christianity, many of the Kings of *France* have died without Male Issue, leaving only Daughters behind them ; yet none of them ever succeeded their Fathers. *Childebert*, King of *West France*, Son of *Clavis I.* left only Two Daughters, who nevertheless did not inherit the Crown ; but he was succeeded by his Brother *Clotarius I.* *Cherebert*, Son of the said *Clotarius*, leaving three Daughters, they did not succeed him, and his Brother *Sigebert* was King after him. *Gontran*, King of *Burgundy* and *Orleans*, Son of the said *Clotarius*, left none other but his only

¹ *Dela Rep. I. 6. c. 5.* towards the End. ² Origines Dign. ch. 2. ³ *Antiq. &c. I. 3. c. 6.* p. 642. ⁴ In-

vent. *upon* Pharamond.

† He would have found it an hard matter to proye this Article.

only Daughter *Chorilda*, who did not succeed him; so his Nephew *Childebert*, Son of his said Brother *Sigebert*, was King. *By these Examples therefore, 'tis evident, that in the First Line of our ancient Kings the Crown of this Kingdom was never worn by the Female Sex.* *Fol. 191.* All this, except the first Period, is to be found Word for Word, in the Speech *du Haillan* lends the Earl of *Artois*, to answer that with which he had furnish'd the English Embassadors.

By this Passage which I have quoted, may be seen how far this Historian is from thinking the calling of *Philip of Poitou* to the Succession of the Crown, by excluding the Daughter of King *Lewis Hutin*, *was not, nor ought to be done.* The Parenthesis therefore, which carries in it these two Notions in that Passage of *du Haillan*, criticiz'd upon by *M. de Verot*, expresses nothing but the Opinion of the too severe Censors of the History of France. The Historian has laid this down, *That pursuant to the ancient Custom before-mentioned, the Daughters did not succeed to the Crown of France.* The Parenthesis insinuates to the contrary, *viz.* that the Exclusion of the Daughter of *Lewis Hutin* was a thing *never before done, and which ought not to be done.* How can it agree with good sense to speak after this manner, unless it be by way of Objection to what is before confirmed by several Examples, and conformable to ancient Custom?

Du Haillan is not satisfied with making it appear, that the Exclusion of the Daughters in relation to the Succession of the Crown, has been an *ancient Custom*, in use, not only in *France*,

France, but also in all the Nations which he terms Barbarous. * He says farther, the *Saint Law* is better, more honourable, and more advantageous, than 'tis ancient. He expatiates in shewing the Advantages of it, and calls it one of the † best Laws that was ever made in any Kingdom. Perhaps it would be no hard matter to shew he is deceived, at least, that he goes too far, when he says afterwards "it would be very necessary to make a Law in *France*, that as the Women are excluded from the Crown, so they should also be from the Administration: For, adds he, *it has cost us very dear*". As if the Kingdom of *France* had never been ill governed, but by Women; or that they had never governed it well. " *Blanche* the Mother of St. *Lewis* (says || *Pasquier*) behaved her self so wifely, that as the *Roman Emperors* took upon them the Appellation of *Augustus*, in commemoration of the many happy Achievements of the Emperor *Augustus*; so anciently the Queens who survived their Husbands, would be called by the Name of *Blanche*, in token of the wise Administration of that Princess". However, *du Haillan's* Notion shews, he could not be capable of insinuating, as the Parenthesis does, that the Exclusion of *Lewis's* Daughter was a thing that *never was*, and *ought not to have been*. It follows therefore, that what he said, was to be understood as coming from such as he calls, the too severe Censors of the History of *France*; and in all likelihood, he meant the *English*; altho'

* Etats des Aff. de Fr. fol. 193. † Ibid. fol. 197.

|| Rech. I. 2. ch. 15. 224.

altho' he is mistaken in that, as I have already shewn. If this be not the Case, the Parenthesis is absolutely foreign to the purpose, and he falls into a manifest Contradiction. I agree, his Style is something confused ; but in Justice we ought to correct and rectifie the Obscurity and Ambiguity of his Terms, or the Turn of his Expression, by those Places which † without difficulty explain his true Meaning.

That we may the better see what that is, and be convinced of its Incompatibility with the Sense of the Parenthesis, we need only read over this Extract from his *State of the Affairs of France*, * Now therefore, we must come to the *Salick Law*, which some Modern Historians have ascribed to *Pharamond*. It has been said, that true it was, the *French* had at first certain Laws, call'd *Salick* and *Ripuary Laws*, which did really exclude the Female Sex from the Succession to Estates ; and upon this they would have us believe, that *Pharamond* made a particular *Salick Law*, by which he expressly declar'd, it was not his Intentions the Female Sex should inherit the Crown of *France*. But why should *Pharamond* make such a Law for the Crown of *France*, since he never was in *Gaul*, now called *France*, nor crossed the *Rhine* ; but kept within his Province of *Franconia*, and was not King of what is called *France* at this day ? Those who would persuade us to this, understand very little of the Government of those ancient Barbarous Nations :

* Quà in sententiâ scriptor fuerit, ex cæteris ejus Scriptis . . . sumi oportebit. Cicer. de Invent. lib. 2. cap. 40.

Fol. 19c, 191.

“ ons : For it was a Custom observ'd among them, not to admit the Daughters to the Succession of their Kingdoms, &c.” Let any one take the trouble to examine the Analysis of this Extract, and he will see, that 'tis impossible better to establish the Antiquity and Authority of the main Point of what is called the *Salic Law*, and which consists in the Exclusion of the Daughters from the Succession to the Crown of France.

Du Haillan then confesses, *The ancient French bad Laws, called Salick and Ripuary Law, which truly cut off the Female Sex from the Inheritance of Estates.* He recites in his History all that is urged on both sides of the Question, Tom. I. 20 and insinuates there, that those Laws were enacted and confirmed by Pharamond. ‘Tis very true, says he, that *there is in the Tables of his Salick Laws, an Article containing these Words. In the Salick Law no part of the Inheritance comes to the Females, the same being acquir'd by the Masculine Sex.* . . . But he pretends, this Article was made only to regulate the *Succession of Estates* in general ; that is, the Succession of Estates of private Families. This he explains in his *Smith of the Affairs of France*, and in his *History of Ripuary Laws*, relating to the Succession of all Generations and Families, and not particular to those of Kingdoms.—† This Article is so far from mentioning the Succession of Kingdoms, that it does not even speak of Fiefs, but only of Allodial Tenures ||. Se

* Erat. Fol. 191. † Hist. Tom. I. 20.

|| To have a just Notion of Fiefs and Allodial Tenures,

Secondly, he maintains, and 'tis a natural Consequence of what he just now laid down, That Pharamond did not make a particular Salick Law, by which he has expressly declared, his meaning was not, that the Female Sex should succeed to the Crown of France. This he proves by two Arguments : The first is, that it was impossible Pharamond could have any such Design, never having set foot in Gaul, *which is now called France. He did not come over the Rhine; he confined himself within the Limits of his Province of Franconia, and never was King of what is called France at this day.* *Du Haillan's second Argument* in this Point is, That such a Law was not necessary; because it was the constant Practice of the barbarous Nations, not to admit the Female Sex to enjoy the Crown. He expresses himself thereupon with nervous Words ; and upbraids those with Ignorance whom he refutes. *Troy, says he, who would make us believe this, know very little of the Government of the ancient Kings*

and consequently wherein they differ, one may consult *Pigquier* in his *Recherches*, I. 2. c. 13. M. *de Bignon*, who treats of Fiefs, in his Notes upon the 5th Chapter of the second Book of *Formulas* by *Marculpus*, and of Allodial Lands, upon the second Chapter of the first Book. But to direct the Reader to a more easie Discovery, let him look into *Furetiere's Dictionary* with the Additions by M. *de Bauval*, and he will there see, in general, that the *Allodes*, which at this day are called *Franc-Allodes*, were Lands enjoyed by Right of Inheritance, or acquired in absolute Property, without any sort of Incumbrance or Charge : Whereas Fiefs were Lands granted for a Term, or for Life, or for ever, and so pass'd to the Heirs of the Donatary ; but in all these Cases, were subject to certain Charges and Conditions. They were formerly called *Benefices*. M. *de Bauval* says, the Word *Fief* is not to be met with in any *Author* of older standing than *Hugh Capit*, or *Charles the Simple*.

Kings and Kingdoms : For it was a Custom among the Barbarous Nations, never to admit the Daughters to succeed to the Crowns. Thus he shews the Substance of the *Salick Law*, by which I mean, the Exclusion of the Female Sex from the right of Inheriting the Crown of France, is of greater Antiquity than *Pharamond*; and of so much Authority, as to render it altogether unnecessary for that Prince to explain it by his Laws; because it was an inviolable Custom, not only in his Dominions, but even amongst all the Barbarous Nations. He comes afterwards to the Examples taken out of the first Line of the Kings of France; which shew, that Three of those Kings having left only Daughters behind them, *now of them ever came to the Crown.* Can their Exclusion from the Royalty be better grounded by Right and Fact? Could *du Haillan*, with these Notions in his Head, intend (unless he were crack-brain'd) that we should understand the Exclusion of the young Princess *Jane*, was *a thing never done before, and ought not to have been done?* Tis clear then, M. *de Vertot* has himself been too severe a Critick upon this Historian, by calling him a bold Author. He makes his Boldness consist in " that he seems to infinite, that the Article treating of the *Salick Law* was introduced into the Chapter *de A. Lodis* by *Philip the Tall*, or at least, that he was the first that took the Advantage of it to exclude his Niece." Here are two Charges of a very different nature. The first is very heinous; the second is nothing. As for the first, it has no Foundation. Does not *du Haillan* clearly establish the *Pre-existence* of the Article in question, when he relates, it as making a Part of

of the *Salick* and *Ripuary Laws* of the ancient *Franks*? Besides, is it not enough, that he says, *Philip the Tall*, to serve his turn, made use of those Words of the *Salick* and *Ripuary Laws*, of the ancient *Franks*, *Let not Women inherit the Salick Land?* Does not this apparently clear him from the Charge of having forged and foisted in that Clause in the Chapter *de Aliodis*?

The second Charge, I said, was nothing. 'Tis true, *au Haillan* pretends, the Earl of *Poitou* was the first who made use of the Sixth Article in the 62d Chapter of the *Salick Laws*, to prove by a written Law, the Male Line only had a right to succeed to the Crown of *France*; but that he was mistaken in it, since that Article did not properly relate to the Succession of this Crown. However, I do not see wherein that Prince was offended. For he did in this case no more than all Kings and private Persons, in the Disputes they happen to be concerned in. Let them have ever so much right on their sides, they themselves, or such as they employ, will bring bad as well as good Arguments to defend their Cause. But after all, if there were any harm in this, the Blame ought to fall upon *Philip's* Ministers : He trusted them, no doubt, with the Care of discussing and examining his Right. He was no more to be responsible for the Abuse of the *Salick Laws* in his favour, than for the impertinent Application of those Words in the Gospel, *Litter spin not*, to draw a conclusion from thence, that the Kingdom of *France*, which gives Flowers de Lys for its Arms, ought not to descend to the Female Sex. He did very ill, if it be true, as *du Haillan* says many affirm, that he gained a great Number of the Nobles, by Pro-

Promises, and the rest by Compulsion, to give a Sanction to the *Salick Law*; that is, the Sixth Article of the Chapter *de Aldiis*, as a Law enacted to regulate the Succession to the Crown. But supposing he had been guilty of that Fault, 'twas wholly personal; it did not affect the Constitution of the Kingdom, nor consequently the Right of those Kings who succeeded *Lewis Hatin* by virtue of that Constitution. So that *du Haillan*, in animadverting upon that Fault, did no other than pass a just Censure upon the Proceeding of *Philip the Tall*, without doing wrong to any one whatever. There is no Boldness in this; 'tis no more than a Freedom and Candor becoming a faithful Historian.

The chief Question concerning this matter at this time is, *Whether the Daughters of the Royal Family of France have a right to succeed to the Crown?* The Negative is very evident, especially since the Death of young King *John*. But is not this what *du Haillan* acknowledges without the least Difficulty. Nay, more: He says expressly, "That altho' the Salick Law were not so old as *Pharamond's* time, 'tis ancient and authentick enough, it having been for a long time practised and observed in *France*". He adds, "'tis Time only gives Admission and Authority to Laws; and when they have once taken place, they serve as a Precedent for the time to come." He goes yet farther, and affirms, (as I have said) more than once, that the Custom upon which this Law is grounded, was in use among all the barbarous Nations; and he shews by three Examples, it was observed as often as there was occasion, in the Line of the *Merovingian Kings*, which he calls the First Line of

upon the Salick Law, examin'd.

61

of our barbarous Kings. Nay, he adds, it was continued as a Law in the Second Line ; which, however, is not true, as I have observed in the Beginning of this Part. Need there any more ? Nay, was there need of so much, to settle the Earl of *Poitou's* Right, and consequently that of all the Kings his Successors, who have worn the Crown of *France* in exclusion of the Female Sex, upon an immovable Foundation ? Father *Daniel*, as much surprized as he is at the Liberty, not to say the Rashness, with which *du Haillan* speaks of the Salick Law, does however sufficiently set forth his Innocence in relation to the Right of *Philip the Tall*; since he makes him acknowledge, the Succession belonged to that Prince *upon another account*, by the ancient Custom of the Countrey. *Upon another account*; that is, without any regard had to the Article of the Salick Law.

Had that old Historian said, In those Days they had not yet heard of any Salick Law of any kind whatever, he would indeed have been very much mistaken ; but his Mistake would not have amounted to a *Liberty*, much less deserved to be called a *Rashness*. At the most, we could only wonder, that one of *du Haillan's* Understanding should † be ignorant of the Fact of which there are so many good Proofs. But 'tis plain, he allows, there were Salick Laws in general. I have shewn, that he makes express mention of them in more than one place ; that he quotes the Chapter *de Alodiiis* ; and lastly, that he says, *Philip the Tall, to serve bis*

[†] Father *Daniel* (who is an excellent Judge) makes great Encomiums upon him.

This turn, made use of these Words in the Salick and Ripuary Laws of the ancient Francks, Let not Women inherit the Salick Lands. So that when he said, *Many affirm the Salick Law had never been heard of before, he must necessarily have taken the Salick Law namely, and by way of distinction according to the common Acceptation of the Title ever since those days ; that is to say, for a certain written Law, which regulating the Succession to the Crown of France, excludes the Daughters, and confines it wholly to the Male Issue.* He says upon this Head, that this Article of the Salick and Ripuary Laws of the ancient Francks, *That Women should not inherit the Salick Lands,* is to regulate the Succession of the Male Line in all Generations and Families, not particularly those of Kingdoms. — — And that it makes no mention of the Crown of France : For adds he, *Pharamond* never thought of that, in regard he never came on this side, nor had any right here.

Is there any thing in this Opinion, for which *du Haillan* deserves to be charged with using so great *Liberty*, or *being rash*, and even called a *Writer*? If he had deserved such Treatment, he would suffer, at least, in very good Company. I have in the Beginning of these Remarks taken notice of several Authors, who say plainly that the Salick Law, taken for the Exclusion of the Daughters from the Crown, was not a written Law, but a *Law of Custom*. That of necessity signifies and supposes, that the Sixth Article of the Chapter *de Aliodis*, in the Collection of the Salick Laws, ought not to be regarded as a Law for the particular Regulation of the Succession of the Crown of France : For if that were

were not the Case, how could we say with *Mercier*, That when *Louis Hutin's* Son died, the Succession of the Male Issue to the Crown, was not established by any written Law ; with M. *Gendre*, that no Law, at least, no written Law, had excluded the Princesses of the Blood ; or with the Author of the *Method for studying History*, That the Salick Law did not pass into a Law, till the Reign of *Philip the Tall*. To speak after this manner, and at the same time acknowledge the Existence of the Sixth Article of the Charter *de Alodii*, before that Prince came to the Throne ; a Man must necessarily be convinced, his Article was not intended to regulate the Succession to the Crown.

It would even be a hard matter to discover any considerable Difference, upon this Subject, between *du Haillan*, and Father *Daniel*, who is one that censures him. “ + Many (says he) talk and hear others speak of the Salick Law, without knowing well what it means ; there is a vulgar Prejudice about it, which is, that this Law refers *only* or *chiefly* (observe these Words, or chiefly) to the Right of the Crown of *France*, by determining the Qualifications of those who may lay Claim to it, and this Opinion is false in several Points.

“ Of Seventy one Articles which make this Law, there are only Three or Four Lines of the Sixty second, which can relate to that Matter, nor do they particularly refer (N.B.) to the Succession of the Male Line to the Crown, but belong generally to all Noble Families ; whose Right, in that respect they

+ Tom. I. col. 8.

“ regulate, as well as that of the Royal Family;
 “ The Words are these; *As for the Salick Land,*
 “ let no Female have any Share in that Inheritance;
 “ but let all go to the Male Issue. By the Salick
 “ Land, was meant the Estates of the Nobility;
 “ and according to some, all Lands reduced by
 “ Conquest, such as were almost all those under
 “ the Monarchy of France, on this side the Rhine.
 “ The occasion of this vulgar Notion upon
 “ this Subject, was the great Dispute formerly
 “ about the Succession of the Crown of France,
 “ between Philip Earl of Valois, and Edward III.,
 “ King of England, upon the Death of Charles
 “ the Handsome. — These Two Princes
 “ Pretensions were examin'd in an Assembly of
 “ the Nobility of France, who by Virtue of that
 “ Article of the Salick Law, decided in Favour
 “ of Philip de Valois.

Du Haillan says all this exactly. He confesses, these Words, *The Female Sex shall not inherit the Salick Land*, make an Article of the Salick and Ripuary Laws of the Ancient Francks: But he would have it understood to relate to the Male Issue of all Generations and Families, not particularly to the Royal Blood, which is the very Notion entertain'd by Father Daniel. Here's another Point in which they agree; *Du Haillan* says also, † *Edward* did not know how to maintain his Right so well, but that *Philip* got into the Throne by *Virtue of the Salick Law*, assisted by the Power and Favour of the People of France, or supported by an ancient *Custom* of the Country.

M. le Gendre would be far more liable to these Ob-

* Etat. &c. Fol. 196. towards the End.

Objections, than *du Haillan*. “Tis an inveterate Prejudice (says he) to believe there is any express Article in that Law, which excludes the Daughters and Female Sex from inheriting the Crown. Of Seventy one Articles which compose that Law, there are only Four or Five Lines relating to that matter: As to what regards the *Salick Land*, says the Sixth Article of the Sixty second Chapter, let no Person have any share in the Inheritance, but let all go to the Male Issue. By the Salick Land was understood Noblemen's Estates, or rather Lands subdued by Conquest, such as those possess'd by the *Franks* on this side the *Rhine*. That, perhaps, which has given occasion for this common Mistake, is, that it was in Virtue of this Article, or rather (N.B.) of a *Custom* as old as the Kingdom it self, that upon the Death of *Charles the Handsome*, the States of France adjug'd the Crown to King *Philip de Valois*.

Philipps, the King of France, was diffidt into

This Fragment is in a manner copied from Father Daniel; however, there are these two Differences; first, this famous Jesuit says, the Judgment in favour of *Philip*, was given in an Assembly of the Lords only; whereas M. le *Gendre* attributes it to States; as Father Daniel also did in his First Edition. Secondly, and which is far more material for me, Whereas Father Daniel says, the Decision was with great reason made in favour of *Philip de Valois*, by virtue of the sixth Article of the 62d Chapter of the *Salick Law*; M. le *Gendre* on the other hand, says, that Prince's Right was acknowledged, rather in pursuance of the ancient Custom of the Kingdom, than of the Article of the *Salick Law*. This Amendment,

*rather, makes it very evident, he does not lay much stress upon the Article *de Alodius*. 'Tis easily perceiv'd, he could not have express'd himself after this manner, had he been of opinion that Article, either in part or wholly was intended to govern the Succession of the Crown. For is it not manifest, a Written Law is ever of greater force and more regarded than a Law which has no other Foundation than Custom? And, no doubt, this was the reason why Philip's Ministers were willing to apply the sixth Article of the Chapter *de Alodius* to his Case. Since therefore M. *le Gendre* allows the Custom to have greater weight and efficacy than the Article, he plainly shews his Opinion, that 'twas never intended to exclude the Female Sex from the Royalty: Nay farther, he says freely, that before Philip the Tall, nothing but ancient Custom had excluded the Princesses of the Blood; and that there was no Law for it, at least no written Law.*

But methinks, Father *Daniel* and M. *le Gendre* are something mistaken in their Chronology, by ascribing the Rise of the Vulgar Error and inveterate Prejudice which they refute, to the Judgment pass'd in favour of *Philip de Valois*. According to my Thoughts, it would have been more regular, to have given it the Date of Philip the Tall's Accession. He was the first who produced the Text of the *Salick Law*, and got it the Sanction of the Nobles of the Realm, as institutred to govern the Succession to the Crown. The Author of the *Method for studying History* would be of my mind, since he says in the Place I have twice quoted, The *Salick Law* pass'd into a Law in the Reign of *Philip the Tall*.

Thus

Thus I have shewn, if *du Haillan* is liable to be censur'd, Father Daniel, who is one that has undertaken him, deserves it no less; and I say as much by M. *de Verot*. "The *Salick Law* (says he p. 339.) "seems to relate only to the Succession and Partition of the Salick Lands belonging to private Families: But it has since been extended even to the Order which is to be observed in the Succession to the Crown. Some Authors have thought this a "forc'd Application." He is not of the same Opinion; but says, however, the *Salick Law* seems to relate only to the Succession and Partition of the Salick Lands amongst the Children of private Families. This alone is saying a great deal. But he says moreover in plain terms, that this Law has since been extended even to the Order to be observed in the Succession to the Crown. Is not this a Confession, that the latter Addition of Power to this Law was not included in the first Intention; at least, that it was not understood so at the time of its first Institution. "I confess (says he again in the last Paragraph of his Dissertation) as I have already said, this Collection of Laws published by our first Kings, *seems to be only designed to regulate the Order of private Succession amongst the Franks and Saliens*. But it must also be allowed, that from the same Laws there is a necessary Consequence to be drawn for the Kingdom it self; which being in its nature perfectly Salick, conquer'd by the Head of the *Saliens*, and the most noble and excellent Fief of the Salick Lands, if one may make use of such an Expression, the Crown of such a Kingdom, whether it be in pursu-

"*ance of the Salick Law, or a Custom of a
more ancient Date, cannot be inherited but
only by the Male Issue of the Family in pos-
session, as hath been all along practised for a
bove 1300 Years.*

From hence it follows, that the Text of the *Salick Law* taken in it self, and in the strict sense, does not confine the Succession of the Crown to the Male Issue only of the Royal Family; since in the bottom twas made for no other purpose than to regulate private Successions amongst the *Franks* and *Salians*; so that it cannot be extended to the Succession of the Kingdom, but by way of *Consequence*. In vain M. *de Vertor* insists upon the Necessity of this Consequence. I have shewn elsewhere, this manner of arguing is indeed very plausible, but not at all concluding. It would be so in things merely Moral or Physical; but not at all in Political Matters. A thousand and a thousand Examples prove this way of Consequence to be insufficient and defective; because in such sort of matters, which in the main are discretionary, it happens we often stop at a certain Point; when, if we would consider them throughly, we might, or at least ought to go greater Lengths. Caprice has often a great share in it.

Now let any one compare the Positions of *du Haillan* and M. *de Vertor*. There will be no real Difference found either in their Principles or Proofs: so that the latter, instead of writing to refute or criticize upon the other, ought on the contrary to have employ'd his Pen in his defence and vindication; since, after all, he does not advance any thing himself which is not to be found in that old Historian, the Examples of *Arthaberick* and

and *Theodatus* excepted. If any one has reason fall out with him, certainly it should not be such a *Frenchman* as M. de *Venot* is. But an *Englishman*, or any other disinterested Person, could be in the right to call *du Haillan* a partial, assemblung and unfaithful Writer in favour of the Kings of *France*, from the Reign of Edward III. King of *England*. 'Tis visible, he set the Pretensions of that Prince, of glorious and immortal Memory, designedly in a false Light. He disguised and represented them quite otherwise than they really were, in order to make them appear false and absurd, by chusing and concealing what they were truly grounded upon, as I think I have made out in an unanswerable manner.

The End of the SECOND PART (cont'd)

of the *Salick Law* (cont'd)

(cont'd) of the *Salick Law* (cont'd)

(cont'd) of the *Salick Law* (cont'd)

(cont'd) of the *Salick Law* (cont'd)

(cont'd) of the *Salick Law* (cont'd)

(cont'd) of the *Salick Law* (cont'd)

(cont'd) of the *Salick Law* (cont'd)

(cont'd) of the *Salick Law* (cont'd)

(cont'd) of the *Salick Law* (cont'd)

(cont'd) of the *Salick Law* (cont'd)

(cont'd) of the *Salick Law* (cont'd)

(cont'd) of the *Salick Law* (cont'd)

(cont'd) of the *Salick Law* (cont'd)

(cont'd) of the *Salick Law* (cont'd)

(cont'd) of the *Salick Law* (cont'd)

(cont'd) of the *Salick Law* (cont'd)



PART III.



The Three Instances of the Stile Law which M. de Verot produces out of the first Family of the Kings of France, he adds three more out of the Third by which it sufficiently appears the second could not furnish him with any, as I have observed. Thus, after having said, that the Crown, which under the third Race went from Father to Son, till the Death of the young King John, Son of Lewis *Hutin*, passed over to the Collateral Branch in the Person of Philip Earl of [†] Poitou, the Elder of Lewis's two younger Brothers, he goes on thus:—
“ This Order of succession in the Royal Family was for the first time troubled by the Claim of Princess Clemence, Daughter of Lewis [‡] Houstin, the Handsome left three Sons, who came to the Crown successively, viz. Lewis *Houstin*, Philip the Tall, and Charles the Handsome. Mezeraie is guilty of a very gross Inadvertency in this matter. He says, a Daughter of the Earl of Burgundy, named Jane, was married to Philip, the King's Eldest Son, then in the Cradle; and his Sister Blanche to the Second, named Charles. Upon Philip Bel. an. 1291.

[†] Philip the Handsome left three Sons, who came to the Crown successively, viz. Lewis *Houstin*, Philip the Tall, and Charles the Handsome. Mezeraie is guilty of a very gross Inadvertency in this matter. He says, a Daughter of the Earl of Burgundy, named Jane, was married to Philip, the King's Eldest Son, then in the Cradle; and his Sister Blanche to the Second, named Charles. Upon Philip Bel. an. 1291.

"*Hutin*, who blaz'd abroad (*fit eclater*) her Pretensions to the Crown". The Obscurity of this Passage puzzled me for a while. By this Order in the Regal Succession, nothing can be meant but the Order whereby the Succession goes to the Collateral Branch, for want of Successors in the direct Line. But the Pretensions of *Lewis Hutin's* Daughter, did not trouble that Order, for they caused no alteration in it: Yet this is the true Notion of the Word *troubling*, in respect of the Order of Succession; such Order cannot be said to be troubled, till it is altered, and the Succession has fall'n into another Channel: Now notwithstanding the Pretensions of the young Prince, the Succession held its Ordinary Course, in default of Male Issue in the direct Line, and pass'd to the next Male in the Collateral. In my Opinion, M. *de Vertot* would have said, that Order was contested, disputed, opposed, for the first time, by the Pretensions of the Daughter of *Lewis Hutin*.

Besides, his Pen has mistaken that Princess's Name, which was *Jane*, Daughter of *Margaret of Burgundy*, *Lewis's* first Wife. *Clemence* was the Name of his second Wife, whom he left big, and who was afterwards deliver'd of a Posthumous Child, that lived but Twenty Days, at most, for Historians differ in that particular.

Lastly, The Princess *Jane* was so very young, that one cannot well say she blazed abroad her Pretensions to the Crown which she laid claim to. She could scarce be Nine Years old when her Father died; and must have wanted considerably of it, if *Lewis Hutin* lived but Twenty two Years, as M. *le Gendre* has happen'd to say, without considering that his Calculation makes the

the second Brother a Year older than the first
 Philip the Tall, he says, died at the Age of
 Twenty eight, after having Reigned five Years.
 It must be then at the Age of Twenty three,
 that he succeeded his elder Brother *Lewis*, whom
 he makes die at Twenty two. *Mezerai* says, that
Lewis died in his Twenty eighth Year; and I
 find by *Turquet's History of Spain*, that Prince
 who was King of *Narbone* in Right of his Mother,
 did not marry, at soonest, before the Year 1306,
 so that his Daughter could be no more than
 Nine Years old in 1316. when he died. 'Tis
 true, M. *de Vertot*'s style seems in this to agree
 with that of *du Haillan*, who says she had a mind
 by the Persuasion of her Uncle on the Mother's
 side, to lay claim to the Crown. But *Mezerai*
 is more exact, "The Friends and Relations
 (says he) of the little Princess, especially
 Eudes Duke of *Burgundy*, were upon the Watch,
 pretending the Crown belonged to her, in case
 the Off-spring of Queen *Clement* should not
 do well." He says also, that after the Death
 of the young King *John*, the Duke of *Burgundy*,
 Uncle to Princess *Jane*, claim'd in her Name.

I believe it will not be disagreeable to find
 here a curious *Anecdote* relating to King *John*,
 which a Friend has been so kind as to communi-
 cate to me. "Being at *Rome* in the Year 1712,
 I ran over an *Italian* Manuscript, composed
 in order to prove, that *John Son of Lewis*
Hutin, and *Clemente* Daughter of *Charles Martel*
King of Hungary, did not die a few Days af-
 ter his Birth, as the *French* Historians tell us:
 To the best of my Remembrance the Sub-
 stance of that Piece, which was thought by
 some Learned Men at *Rome*, to be well writ-
 ten,

" ten, and as well supported as the Nature of
" the Fact would allow, is this ; The Queen
" being in great Apprehensions for the new-born
" Child, thought it the best way to take the
" Advantage of an Opportunity which offer'd
" to save his Life, at the Expence of his losing
" the Crown. The Nurse's Child happening to
" die, Clemence gave out it was *John* : and the
" young King was put into the Hands of a Siem-
" nosis, who was not, however, let into the Se-
" cret. This *Italian* carried him into his own
" Country, and having adopted him, left him
" Heir to his Name and Estate. The Queen
" upon her Death-Bed revealed the whole Mat-
" ter to a Monk, with a Design he should tell it
" to *John* ; but whether through Fear, or what-
" ever other Motive, the Monk retain'd the Secret
" to his Death-sickness, and then unburthen'd him-
" self to a Friend, who being either more Con-
" sciencious or Gouragious, went to *Italy*, and
" discover'd what he had been intrusted withal.
" After that, *John* publishing to the World
" what he thought himself to be, made several
" fruitless Applications for Succour to the Prince-
" ces of the Time, particularly to the King of
" Hungary, his near Relation, who howsoever
" well inclin'd, was too much taken up by his
" own Affairs, to be able to do any thing to the
" Purpose, towards reestablishing him upon
" the Throne of France. However, *John* did
" not omit to leave the Memory of his Preten-
" sions registred in all the Documents of his Fa-
" mily, and his Children did the same. This is
" what the Author of this Manuscript makes ap-
" pear by well attested Extracts taken out of the
" Registers and Monuments of *Sicenna*.

If

L

writ-
ten,

If *Mezerai*, and other Historians are right in attributing the Death of *Lewis Hutin* to a violent Poison given him by an unknown Hand, the fear Queen *Clemence* was under for her Son's Life, was but too well grounded. However, it seems to me very incredible she should resolve so suddenly as in Eight or Twenty Days to take so desperate a Party as she is made to do in the *Itali.* *an* Manuscript; she could not be so very fearful as she is represented in that Adventure, since, according to Father *Daniel*, she had the Courage to list her self in the Duke of *Burgundy*'s Faction for her Neice, against *Philip the Tall*. Besides, how came it to pass she should say nothing of an Affair of that Importance, either after the Death of that King, or of *Charles the Handsome*, whom she survived some Months? Had she not a very proper Opportunity to discover it, during the Dispute between *Edward III.* King of *England*, and *Philip de Valois*, upon the Succession to the Crown of *France*? Lastly, Is it likely *John* should not only leave his Pretensions registered in the Writings of the Family, but also make application to the Princes of that time for Assistance, and that there should not remain the least sign of it in any of the Histories of those Potentates to whom he address'd himself? Can it possibly be, that not one of the many Letters he must have wrote to the several Courts whose favour he implor'd, should be preserved?

As for the Extracts of the Registers and *Monuments of Sienna*, we ought to know what they are, in order to make any just Conjecture from them. Suppose there had lived at that time a whimsical Fellow, who was possessed with the belief of being King *John*, and consequently took

took that Title upon him in Publick Acts ; this would have been sufficient to contrive a Romance, and farther it upon the Registers of *Sicca* ; for Publick Notaries allow and give to every one the Title and Quality they think fit to assume. If any Monument or Publick Act of the Town it self should be shewn, it would be a quite different case ; but in all appearance there never was any such thing. Could this have been a secret to the Kings of France ? Would they not have complained of it, and express'd their Resentment ? And could all this have happen'd without some mention of it in History ? For my part, I am persuaded, the real Death of little King *John*, was the occasion of the Dispute about the Succession between the Princess his Sister, and *Philip Earl of Poitou*.

Upon this Dispute, the Dissertation goes on thus, " But *Papire Masson* tells us, the Peers and Barons of *France* met at *Paris*. *Mezerai* supposes the States were conven'd, and that it was there determined, that the Salick Law, and the Custom inviolably observed by the French, did exclude the Daughters from the Crown". This Account, in my Mind, is not clear enough ; there seems to be this Difference between *Papire Masson* and *Mezerai*, that whereas the first makes the Peers and Barons assemble at *Paris*, the other convenes the States. Yet *Mezerai* allows of the first Assembly ; but gives us to understand, that besides, the States were likewise call'd together, unless he confounds one with the other ; I shall return to this Point hereafter : What I would principally observe here, is, that this Historian does not say, it was determin'd by the Assembly, *that the Salick Law and*

*and the Customs inviolably observed by the French, excluded the Daughters from the Crown ; at least I find nothing more in the Abridgement of Mezerai, for I have not the large History, then a plain Oath, not to acknowledge any other King but Philip and his Heirs * Male, excluding the Daughters. Me- thinks, when an Author is quoted, he should not be made to say any thing more than he really does ; allowing every one the Advantage of making such Observations as he can, of which the Readers will be able to judge, when they see exactly in what the Authority produced consists.*

This Passage of Mezerai is very obscure, and fit to shew with how much reason he has been blamed for his manner of writing. These are his own Words ; “ The Estates assembled at Pa-
“ ris, where were the greatest part of the Lords,
“ the Representatives of the Corporations and Uni-
“ Towns, and especially the Burgeses and Uni-
“ versity of Paris, took an Oath before the Chan-
“ cellor, (Peter d'Arablay, afterwards Cardinal)
“ not to acknowledge any other for King, than
“ Philip and his Heirs Male, excluding the
“ Daughters.” There is no question to be made, but he means the General States. Will he say then that the Deputies of the Towns were there ? But to what purpose did he take notice of this Cir-
cumstance ? Can such Assemblies be held without those + Deputies ? Did the Burgeses and Univer-

* Philip had at that time a Son, who died a few Days after, in the beginning of Lent. Father Daniel.

† According to Father Daniel, France was first repre-
sented by the Three Bodies, now called the Three Estates, in the Year 1356, under the Reign of King John. That
which is call'd the Third State, had not before appear'd

University of *Paris*, especially, attend at the Assembly of the States? In which, says he, the greatest part of the Lords, and Deputies of the Corporations and Towns, and particularly the Burgeses and University of Paris, were present. There is no likelihood of it. Does he mean (as is more reasonable to suppose from the nature of the Thing, altho' the Construction will not bear it) that whilst the States were sitting, amongst whom were the greatest part of the Lords, that is, the Chief Men of the Kingdom, the Dependencies of the Corporations and Towns, and especially the Burgeses and University of *Paris* took an Oath? &c. This is what *Giles* intimates in his Chronicle, " At that time (says he) Peter d'Arrablay was Chancellor of *France*, before whom the greatest part of the Lords and Nobles of *France* appear'd, and protested not to acknowledge any other King than the said *Philip*, and the Heirs Male of his Body, || if he should have any; in which the Burgeses and University of *Paris* joined." But if it were so, it's surprizing *Mezerai* should not place the Nobles amongst those who took that Oath. Father *Daniel* says they all did: 'Tis true, that four or five Lines below, he adds, " The Doctors and Masters of the University generally approved of the Oath; but whether it was not requir'd of them, or for some other Reason not taken notice of, they did not swear." In this he varies from *Mezerai* and *Giles*, who say the University took the Oath. Again he differs

on such occasions, as part of the Body of the States, authorized to give their Votes in Publick Debates. *Tom.*

2. *col.* 548.

|| He forgot *Philip* had a Child at that time.

differs in this; *Mezerai* says, the Oath was taken before the Chancellor: *Peter d'Arrablay*. *Peter d'Arrablay* then was Chancellor at that time which is also particularly observed by *Gili*. But Father *Daniel* says, he had been Chancellor under *Philip the Handsome*, which Expression implies he was not so after the Expiration of that Reign *. However, 'tis certain he was made Chancellor in 1316. as *M. le Gendre* mentions in his History of the Great Officers, &c. in the Third Volume of the Edition in Folio; 'tis not to be doubted but he was advanced to that Honour by *Lewis Huitin*, after *Stephen de Mornay* who enjoy'd it in the Year 1315. A third Difference is, that *Mezerai* says, *Peter d'Arrablay* was made Cardinal after the Assembly. *M. le Gendre* says likewise, it was in 1317. at the earnest Suit of *Philip the Tall*, for whom he had done very signal Services: *D'Arrablay*, adds he, was one of those who had chiefly contributed towards maintaining of *Philip* upon the Throne, and breaking the Faction that favour'd the only Daughter of *Lewis Huitin*. On the other hand, in Father *Daniel's* History, as well as *Spondens*'s Annals, we find him already a Cardinal. I make no question but the two latter are in the right, because I perceive in *du Chesne's* History of the Popes, *Peter d'Arrablay* Chancellor of *France*, was one of the Eight Cardinals whom || *John XXII.* elected Pope *August* the seventh, 1316. created on

* The Office of Chancellor of *France*, was not in those Days given for Life, as it is now.

|| This was *James Dugat*, Son of a Shoemaker of *Chartres*. The Cardinals not agreeing in the Election of a Pope, consented to accept of whomsoever *James* should nominate, and he named himself.

on the Fast of the Advent of that same Year ; and consequently some Weeks before the Assembly of the Great Men and Peers. Here is a fourth Difference. *Mezerai* mentions the Oath to be taken whilst the States were sitting ; and Father *Daniel*, in the time of the Assembly, which was about the Purification. With how much reason does *La Mothe le Vayer* assert the Uncertainty of History, in a Treatise written by him for that purpose ?

I have said, *Mezerai*, as well as *Papire Masson*, makes mention of this Assembly. Nevertheless *Philip* was already in possession of the Crown, the Assembly did nothing more than confirm and acknowledge him in that Possession. *Mezerai* adds, that on the Ninth of *January* he was consecrated at *Rheims*; whereas he does not date the Assembly of the Peers and Great Men till about the Feast of the Purification. This is another very obscure Passage : “ The Great Men of the Kingdom (says that Historian) assembled in Parliament about the Feast of the Purification, confirmed the Right of the Heirs Male, and gave Judgment in favour of *Philip*, who with a numerous Retinue went to be consecrated at *Rheims* on the 9th of *January*, the Gates of the Town being shut for fear of any Opposition.” Whoever should read this Relation, without knowing the Times of the two Festivals therein mentioned, would believe the Ceremony of *Philip*’s Consecration followed the Decision of the Great Men and Peers assembled in Parliament ; and by consequence, that the Feast of the Purification was before the 9th of *January*; a Chinese would understand it thus. What would it have cost

cost *Mezerai* to have said, *who with a numerous Retinue, was gone to be crowned at Rheims on the 9th of January?* Or rather, would it not have been better to relate the two Facts in their natural Order?

It appears by the Relation of *Mezerai* and all other Historians I know of, except † M. *Brienneville*, that *Philip*, without waiting till the Crown was adjudg'd him, seized upon it by way of Anticipation, in getting himself consecrated by his own Authority. I don't think he had the Folly to believe, the Oil of the miraculous Vial was of sufficient virtue to make him King *ex opere operato*, as we say. He was not of a Complexion to be so fond of that fine Present from Heaven, as M. *de Verter* is pleased to represent it; as if he had been one of the Knights of the Holy Vial. He has wrote a Dissertation in defence of the Fabulous Story concerning it, which immediately follows that under examination, and which makes a strange Contrast, in the *Memoirs of Literature*, taken from the *Register of the Royal Academy of Inscriptions and Polite Learning*, &c. 'Tis not my Business to determine whether in this last Dissertation his Heart went along with his Hand. All I know, is, that the warmest Advocates for such kind of Shams, are often those who ridicule them most; Witness this Passage of *Naudæana*, p. 102. "The Jesuit *Melchior Incboffer* has publish'd a Book, entituled

† He says in his *Methodical Abridgment of the History of France*, that *Philip* was acknowledged King by the States after young *John* died, on the 25th of November 1316, and that he was crown'd six Weeks after upon the *Epiphany*. M. *du Pin* crowns him on the same Day; which shews another Difference about the Date of his Coronation.

“ led *Veritas vindicata*, touching a Letter which
“ the People of *Messina* in *Sicilij*, fay,^{say}, was writ-
“ ten and sent to them by the Virgin Mary.
“ And when I alledged several Arguments to
“ prove that Letter was forged by the Inhabi-
“ tants of *Messina*, he told me, he knew all that
“ as well as I ; and that all he had said of it in
“ his Book, was only to gratifie and obey his
“ Superiours, who had laid that Injunction upon
“ him ; but after all, he did not believe one
“ Word in the Letter. Yet this is the way Er-
“ rors and Abuses spread themselves over the
“ World ; and after this manner the simple-
“ hearted are continually deceived.”

At least, it will not be laid to the charge of
our Famous Author, if for the future we do not
believe this celebrated Vial was *given*, and even
brought by God, taking his Words in a strict
sense : For he has been pleas'd to alledge, without
any sign of Doubt or Distrust, the Judgment
of a Monk, whom he qualifies with the fine
Title of a *devout Votary*; and who, not satisfied
that an Angel should bring it, *fairly resolves* (these
are M. *de Vertot's* Words) *it was the Holy Ghost in*
Person under the Shape of a Dove. He adds, This
devout Votary was *Aimonius*, a Monk of the Abbey
of *Fleury* upon the *Loire*, *who flourished in the 9th*
Century. If that be so, he arrived to a very uncom-
mon and extraordinary Age, since he was still
living in the Beginning of the Eleventh. We
must not confound him with another Monk of
the same Name belonging to the Abbey of *Sr.*
Germain des Prez; for it was the latter who lived
in the 9th Century.

M. *de Vertot's* Zeal for the Holy Vial is so much
the more remarkable, in that several Authors of
great

great consideration look upon it as deserving little Credit; amongst others, is the President *de Thou*. Certainly the President *Fauchet* had no great Opinion of it. " † "Tis very much (says he) that *Gregory* Archbishop of *Tours*, who was born but forty Years at farthest after *Clovis* was baptized, shou'd forget the Miracle of the Holy Vial." He adds a little lower, " As a Miracle once received, gives birth to another, they add, that an Angel brought *Clovis* a blue Shield sew'd with Flower de Luces of Gold to wear it instead of his own, which was green, with three Toads or Frogs; or Argent, with three Diadems Gules, according to *A. milius.*" *Fauchet* shews afterwards, the Cheat of this second Miracle. Father *Petau* speaks of that of the Holy Vial after such a manner, as 'tis plain he gave it no credit. I may say the same of the Abbot of *St. Remy* and Father *le Cointe*, without running any great hazard of being contradicted. *Mezerau* speaks of it very ironically; and Father *Daniel* cannot better shew the little account he makes of that Incident, than in not vouchsafing to take notice of it in his History of *Clovis*, following therein the Example of Father *Turcelin*, also a Jesuit, and the Bishop of *Meaux*. He shews by this Silence that he looks upon it as one of the Facts, of which in his Preface he says, an Author ought not to make the least mention, not even by taking notice he doubts of the Truth of them. M. *le Gendre* falls pretty bluntly upon that Subject in the Beginning of the First Edition of his History of *France*. He handles the Holy Vial there as if he

† Antiq. Eccl. L. 3. ch. 18.

he would break it to pieces. But in the Second Edition he fingers it more tenderly. Perhaps a View of this Difference may not be unacceptable in this place.

First Edition.

It is reported by a far more venerable and ancient Historian, that the Ecclesiastical Officer who carried the Holy Chrism, not being able to come up time enough because of the Throng, a Dove in the same Instant carried a Vial full of Liquor in her Bill ; and as soon as she had put it into the hands of St. Remy, disappeared. Others, without reflecting, add, that all our Kings have been anointed with this Oil.

[*Not one of the first Line w^ms.*] *Pepin*, Founder of the second, is the first who thought to be sacred, to make himself more respected. As much as we ought to admire and reverence such Miracles as are well attested, so much Cau-

New Edition.

It is reported by a far more venerable and ancient Historian (*Hincmar Rheims*) who, from what he had heard say, and gather'd out of the old Chronicles, composed an History of the Life of St. *Remy*, that the Ecclesiastical Person, whose Office it was to hold the Holy Chrism, with which the Bishop was going to anoint the new Christian, not being able to come up time enough, because of the Throng, a Dove, to supply his place, carried a Vial of Liquor in his Bill ; and as soon as she had put it into the hands of St. *Remy*, disappear'd. *Gregory de Tours*, who liv'd soon after *Clotvis*, and who seems to take pleasure in giving a florid Description of the

First Edition.

tion and Prudence ought we to make use of in not blindly believing, those which have no other Foundation than the Fancy of certain Zealots, who make no scruple to invent them. *Gregory de Tours*, as credulous as any Man living, makes no mention of the Holy Vial, although he seems to take pleasure in describing, and that in the most florid Terms, the chief Circumstances of *Clavis's* Christening. *Gregory* lived in the time of that Prince's Grandchildren. None of our Historians, down to the Reign of *Charles the Bald*, say any thing of that Miracle. The first time it was mention'd, was *three hundred and sixty years after*, and then it was upon the credit of an old History, which for a long time had been quite buried in Obscurity. When

the chief Circumstances of that Monarch's Christening, makes no mention of the Vial brought from Heaven. Nor is there any notice taken of it by our Historians, till the time of *Charles the Bald*. The first that speaks of it, is *Archbishop Hincmar*, which Prelate wrote about three Centuries and an half after *Clavis* died.

[†] This Observation by *M. le Gendre* puts me in mind of a very good Remark in that Excellent Treatise, *De la Restitution des Grands*, in 1665, without the Printers Name, " If this Maxim, That 'tis not lawful to do evil for Religion's sake, had been follow'd by the Church, we should not have had so many *false and fabulous Miracles*, which have been sow'd among the People, under pretence of advancing the Glory of God; as, many things prejudicial to the Publick, have been introduced, under pretence of serving the Prince and Government.

Authors that are contemporary, or at least, the most ancient, concur in their Silence about any notable Event, 'tis left to the Reader to think what Credit such old Stories deserve.

I very much question, whether in this Point the second Edition will be so well approved of as the first, amongst reasonable Persons, and such as are not bias'd by human Regards, to favour Superstition, and even something that's much more horrible than bare Superstition. There is no Conscience so hardened, as not to be wounded with Grief, when phantaſtical Objects have a sort of Veneration paid them, which would be very blame-worthy, altho' they had all the Reality in the World. 'Tis making ones self accessory to so criminal and sacrilegious an Abuse, not to do all one can to put a stop to its Progress.

However, M. *de Verot* is not yet arrived at the degree of an *Adept* in relation to the Holy Vial; at least, his Faith in that respect has not attained to the *Fulness of Perfection*: For he has not said a Word of the Miracle that has preserved the Liquor in its primitive Quantity, for more than Twelve Centuries, notwithstanding the Use of it in consecrating so many Kings. Father *t Buffiere* assure us, that it has been used at above sixty Coronations; yet for all that has suffer'd no Diminution! *Nunquam apparuit sic;* such a Miracle as this was never seen in *Israël*. Besides the Continuation of the same Quantit-

[†] *In unione ampulla delata celitus prodigium fuit omnibus sequitur, cuius liquor effusus plus quam sexasies nullā ope humana restitutus, regni cui continuo est durationem sequeretur aut sequitur.* Flosc. Hist. P. 169. Venetii 1672.

ty, the long Duration of this incorruptible Liquor, has given it the highest Advantages over the consecrated Elements of the Eucharist, altho' it be pretended that there is no other Substance in them than the Body and Blood of our Lord. There is no consecrated Host or Wine which does not corrupt and waste away in a very little space of time. Here is then Miracle upon Miracle; the whole, in truth, depends upon our good Opinion of the Integrity of the Keepers of this Holy Vial; and God knows what a Dependance that is. Besides, when Father *Bussiere* wrote that it had served at more than sixty Coronations, he exceeded the Truth prodigiously. 'Tis hard to know distinctly what Kings were consecrated before *Perpin*; but even those were not at *Rheims*. Of the two last Families several have been crowned at other Places, as M. le * *Thou* says upon occasion of the Coronation of *Henry the Great*: And this is what may be seen more at large in *du Chevne*.

Bishop *Godeau*, who seems to carry his Credulity for the Holy Vial to the highest pitch, || has also said, without Exception, that all *Clodius's* Successors were anointed, as he was, with the Heavenly Chrism. However, it does not appear, any of his Descendants were anointed with it. So that *Clodius*, perhaps, was the only King of the *Merovingian* Race who received that Honour. I know not whether that Famous Bishop and great Wit banter'd, when he added, "I fansie, no † *Frenchman* will be permitted

* Lib. 108. towards the End.

† Antiq. &c. l. 2. Tr. 2. P. 373. . .

|| About the Year 495. §. 67.

‡ Cardinal *du Perron* went much farther: He said, no

ted to dispute against so great a Privilege granted to their Princes, and of which Tradition has so well establish'd the Belief in the Minds of the People." But sure I am, Father Daniel, *M. le Gendre* and many more, would laugh at his Simplicity, if they could believe he was in earnest. Whether designedly, or not, he as discover'd the greatest Motive for engaging the French in the defence of the Holy Vial. Is not the Strength of Evidence, but an old prejudice entertrain'd for a politick Reason, by a National Interest in the keeping it up; because they find in it so divine a *Relieu*^o to the Glory of the Kings of France. As if History did not make them shine enough, without having recourse to Fabulous Ornaments. The greater our zeal is for our Princes, the more cautious should we be not to give them a false Lustre, for fear of exposing them to Ridicule.

As for *Philip the Tall*, whatever he thought of the † Holy Vial at *Rheims*, he foresaw, without doubt, his Consecration would very much con-

^o French Catholick could call the History of the Holy Vial in question, without shewing himself impious to Country and Religion. *Perroniana*, p. 8. Who, after this, would believe what is said of him, that he was at loss about the Immortality of the Soul, and even the existence of God?

† There is another at *Tours*, with which Henry IV. wasointed at *Chartres*, and is older by a whole Century than that at *Rheims*. The Publick would reap far greater benefit by it, if it were communicated, and had the same Effect, as upon St. Martin Bishop of *Tours*. An Answer, says *Spondanus*, made use of it to heal him of the wounds he got by falling down Stairs, according to the Testimony of *Sulpicius Severus*, &c. upon the Year 94.

conduce towards getting the Crown adjudged him by the Peers and Great Men of the Kingdom when they should meet, according to the English Maxim, which holds true in all Countries, *That of twelve Points of the Law, Poffum, worth eleven.* He fancies also, that Pomposus remony would not fail of procuring him the Voice of the People; who looking upon the Oil of the Holy Vial as the Fruit of some Treason in Paradise, could never be persuaded that Evidence would suffer one Drop of it to be profaned in the Coronation of any Usurper of the Crown. The Quantity, I have mentioned, all they mix with the Holy Chrism, and 'tis applied with the Thumb, as *du Chevne* says, to seven different Parts of the Body, making the Sign of the Cross, *That after such exterior Ceremony, the People may not be ignorant of the Authority and Sovereign Power God bestows on the King; how to avoid, as the Plague and Destruction of the State, such as want that distinguishing Mark.* Rec & Antiq. I. 2. Traité 2. p. 4*i*4.

Philip then got himself Crown'd in a haste. And farther, left the Ceremonies should be interrupted by any Opposition or Protestation, which might weaken his Validity, he took care the Gates of the Town should be shut, and no one admitted that was not on his side; however, not to renounce the Formalities of Right, in making use of the means of Fact, he summon'd together the Peers and Great Men of the Kingdom: This Assembly was held about the Feast of the Purification that is to say, above three Weeks after the Coronation of the new King. Pray observe here how Authors differ; *Papire Messon* spea-

only of this Assembly of the Peers and Great Men ; I quote him after M. *de Verot*. *Mezerai* will have it, that there was also a Meeting of the States. *Spondens* mentions the States only, and gives them the same Date *Mezerai* fixes for the Assembly of Peers and Great Men : I thought to have found this Matter clear'd up by Father *Daniel* or M. *le Gendre*, but this latter takes notice only of the Assembly of Great Men and Peers ; nevertheless, he says in the Beginning of the History of *Philip de Valois*, that an express Law was made in favour of the Male Issue, by the States held at *Paris*, after the Death of *Louis Hutin*. Father *Daniel* expresses himself in such ambiguous Terms, as neither denote clearly and precisely either the one or the other ; “ The King (says he, at the Beginning of his History of *Philip the Tall*) called together an Assembly on the Feast of the Purification, at which a great Number of the Nobility, almost all the Prelates, and the most considerable Burgesses of *Paris* were present, the University was also called.” One does not know what Name to give such an Assembly. Is it the Parliament ? But we find many in it who have no Right to sit in Parliament, as a great Number of the Nobility, the Burgesses of *Paris*, and the University. Is it the Assembly of the States ? But would they have admitted the most considerable Burgesses and University of *Paris* ? I could have wish'd that able Writer, who knows so well and practises the Rules of Precision, had not been negligent in a Circumstance where it was material enough to have observed them.

N

If

If I durst give my Opinion, I should say there was no other Assembly than that of the Peers and Great Men in Parliament held about the Feast of the Purification : 'Tis very likely, that the King being sure of the Burgeses of Paris, and Members of the University, contriv'd it so, that both one and the other should have Admiration ; not as being of the Number of Voters, but as *Assistants*, to be Witnesses of what pass'd there ; and it may be, to contribute by their Countenance, Behaviour and Acclamations, towards the Approbation of his Coronation, in case the Members of the Assembly had not been sufficiently determin'd about it. As for the States, there is all the room in the World to believe they were not held afterwards. Is it likely Philip, who was already in Possession of the Throne, acknowledg'd and confirm'd by an Assembly of the Great Men and Peers of the Realm, would call the States together to put his Right to the Crown again into Debate ? *Papquier* makes no mention of the States ; but says, the Kingdom was declared by Parliament to belong to Philip the Tall. *Liv. 2. ch. 14.* towards the End.

M. Brianville, who is for the meeting of the States upon this occasion, does not only say, they declared King Philip's Coronation valid, by virtue of the Salick Law, but adds, The Power of that Law was *solemnly confirm'd in the Presence of the Pope's Legate*. This last Circumstance, too much to the Advantage of the See of Rome, deserves to be taken notice of, and the rather because it is false ; but lest it should detain me too long, it shall be the Subject of a Second Addition to these Remarks.

I return then to M. *de Verot*; when he produces a Second Instance of the Salick Law in the third Race, in the Person of *Charles the Handsome*, he only mentions it, nor was there any thing more to be said, since there happen'd no Dispute about it. But in his Relation, and passing to the Third Instance, he mistakes the Number of the Daughters of *Philip* and *Charles*. " *Philip* the Tall (says he) left only *three* Daughters, and the Crown, after his Death, went without Commission to *Charles Earl of March*, known in our History by the Name of *Charles the Handsome*." That Prince, as well as the Two Kings his Brethren, had but *one* Daughter. 'Tis strange Authors should differ so much about the Daughters of these two last Kings. *Pasquier* and *du Chesne* agree in their Reckoning and Division, with M. *de Verot* on the contrary. *Du Verdier* in his History of *Spain*, says, that *Charles* died, leaving *no Children*. According to *de Serres* he left two Daughters, and his Wife big of a third. *Mezerai* and Father *Daniel* give him Two, and *Philip* Three. M. *le Gendre* does not fix the Number of *Philip's* Daughters; and says, as M. *Brianville*, that *Charles* had no more by his Third Wife, than that Child of which he left her big. But the Truth is this; *Philip* the Tall left *four* Daughters; *du Haillan* in his State of *France*, names them, *Jane*, *Margaret*, *Mary* and *Blanche*; indeed in the Beginning of his History of that King, he mentions Three only; the Eldest, he says, was married to *Eudes Duke of Burgundy*, the Second to *Lewis* Grandson of *Robert Earl of Flanders* and *Nevers*, and the Third to the Dauphin of *Viennois*. M. *de Brianville* calls the latter *Jabeau*, and Father *Daniel*

nier, Isabella; whereas by all others she is nam'd *Mary*. But towards the End of the same History, *du Haillan* adds *Blanche*, who was a Nun, and a few Pages before, he mention'd them all Four. As for *Charles the Handsome*, he left by his Third Wife *Jane d'Evreux*, a Daughter nam'd *Mary*; and that Queen was brought to Bed, a few Days after his Death of another Daughter nam'd *Blanche*, who married *Philip Duke of Orleans*: If then we join to these *Six, Jane* the Daughter *Lewis Hutin*, I shall have shewn, as I engaged, that at the time of the Dispute between *Edward III.* King of *England*, and *Philip de Valois*, there were Seven Princesses, Daughters of the three last Kings. This Detail therefore was material, and even necessary to my Design. Yet there are some *English* † Authors, who have said, That the three Kings, Brethren to *Isabella*, King *Edward's* Mother, left no Children: Into which Mistake they have, no doubt, fallen, by imagining, that it must have been so; because had it been otherwise, they would have been at a loss how to make out *Edward's* Pretensions to the Crown of *France*, for want of knowing how his Right was grounded; which is not only very surprizing, but altogether unpardonable.

Mezerai was mistaken when he said, *Mary Eldest Daughter of Charles the Handsome*, outlived her Father but a few Years: Father *Daniel* says also, she did not live long. But *Morerry* dates her Death Thirteen or Fourteen Years after that of *Charles*, in 1341. in the Article concerning *Jane d'Evreux*; and in the Article concerning *Charles*

† See Speed, Meriton, Medulla Hist. Anglic. by Howell, &c.
Baker makes meer Nonsense of this matter.

Charles the Handsome, as also in that of *Mary*, her Decease is said to have been in 1342. In this he has err'd by much; there is Proof that she liv'd even Nineteen Years longer. This is her Epitaph in the Chapel of our Lady *La Blanche* at Sr. *Dennis*; “† Here lies Madam *Mary* of *France*, Daughter of *Charles* King of *France* and *Navarre*, by Madam *Jane d'Evreux*; who died on the Sixth Day of *October*, in the Year 1361.” Her Sister *Blanche* whose Epitaph joins to hers, died in 1392. ‘Tis plain this Difference was the occasion of Dom *Germain Miller's* saying, that *Mary* died young in respect of her Sister; for after all, she lived at least above Thirty five Years.

The Historians have also made several Mistakes about the Wives of *Lewis Huitin* and *Charles the Handsome*. *Du Haillan* has unluckily said in the Passage cited by *M. de Verot*, that the *Earl of Burgundy* was Uncle by the Mother's side to Princess *Jane*, *Lewis's* Daughter. It had been well if *M. de Verot* had rectified that mistake. The old Historian would have said as he does in other places, the *Duke of Burgundy*: For it was the Duke, and not the Earl of *Burgundy*, who was Brother to that King's first Wife. *De Serres* calls the second *Constance*, forgetting how a few Lines before he had called her *Clemence*, which was her true Name. * *Spondens* having honestly, and without considering, copied *de Serres*, is guilty of the same Blunder. *Froissart*, in the Passage cited by *M. de Verot*, speaking of *Charles the Handsome*, says, *His first wife*

† *Tresor sacre de St. Denis par Dom Germain Miller.* 432.

* Ad ann. 1314. §. 9. 1316. §. 4.

*Wife was one of the finest Women in the World, and
was the Earl of Artois's Daughter.* Who would
make any difficulty of believing this last Article,
upon the Testimony of this Canon, who
was a contemporary Author, and whose † Chro-
nicles

† Contemporary Authors, generally speaking, are the best Springs of History : Nevertheless what Falsities do they give out, sometimes designedly, and at others thro' Mistake ? For example ; to what but Dishonesty, can one impute that, which the Famous Count *de Buffi Rabutin* has had the Boldness to say in his History of *Lewis XIV.* That the Count (now Duke) of *Lauzun*, who commanded the French Auxiliaries in King *James's* Army in *Ireland*, won the Battle at the *Boyne* ? This is a notorious Falshood. There are several other Mistakes upon the same Subject, in the anonymous History of that Prince, which is otherwise well wrote, and has been lately added together with that of *Lewis XIII.* to *Merera's Chronological Abridgment.* “ King *William*, says that Author, made himself Master of the strongest Places in the Kingdom of *Ireland*, which the Battle of the *Boyne* entirely reduced to his Obedience.” In this Passage there are two Facts which are not true : The first, that King *William* was already Master of all the strong Places in *Ireland*; and the second, that the Battle of the *Boyne* completed the Reduction of that Kingdom. *Ireland* did not entirely submit till the Year following, by the Capitulation of *Limerick*. “ It cost Duke *Schomberg* and Mr. *Walker* the Clergymen their Lives, says this anonymous History, being both kill'd near the Person of that March ; he was also wounded himself, a Cannon-Ball having grazed upon his Shoulders, and another carried off one of his Boots. But the Sight of his own Blood serving only to encourage him, &c.” The Duke was not killed near the King. That Prince was not wounded at the Passage ; it was the Day before, in viewing the Enemy, and looking out for the best Fords. And why the Shoulders, since only one was hurt ? I observe, this new Chronologist has forgotten that famous Sea-Victory obtained by Mr. *Ruyfsl*, at present Earl of *Orford*, over the Count *de Tourville*, in 1692.

nicles are reckoned the best Fountain of the History of his time, notwithstanding his speaking so favourably of the English, has got him the Name of a mercenary Writer in France? However, he was mislaken : The Wife of *Charles* named *Blanche*, was the Daughter of the Earl of *Burgundy*. Her Mother *Maud* was Countess of *Aragon*¹⁰²⁵ in her own Right, as we have seen before ; and this is what has deceived *Froissart*. Besides, this Earl of *Burgundy*, which all our Historians call *Otheo*, or *Othelin*, had quite a different Name ; for it was *Hugo*. *Blanche*, Daughter of the Earl of *Burgundy*, was Sister to *Jane*, *Philip* the Tall's Wife. Now here is their Father's Name, in *Philip* and *Jane's* Epitaph.

“ * Here lies King *Philip* the Tall, King of France and Navarre, Son of *Philip* the Hand-some ; who died January the Third, 1321.

“ And the Heart of Queen *Jane* his Consort, Daughter of the Noble Prince Count *Hugo* of Burgundy, who died the Twenty first of February, 1329.” To me it seems impossible all our Historians should be deceiv'd in the Name of this Earl ; nor can it be conceiv'd he should have a wrong Name given him in his Epitaph. Could he be named *Hugo* and *Othelin* both ? Lastly, *de Serres* calls *Charles* the Hand-some's last Wife *Margaret*, whereas 'tis most certain her Name was *Jane*. Thus we have at every turn an Instance how distrustful we ought to be of Historians. These kind of Examples are in themselves of very little Consequence ; but the reason of my taking notice of them, is, that they are of service to shew how much care is ne-

* *Le Tresor Sacré de St. Denis, &c.* p. 277.

necessary in examining all sorts of Authors, when their Authority is made use of. Without this Precaution, there is ever great danger of being deceiv'd.

To make good what I have said, here is another Proof not altogether foreign to the Case, since it relates to a Fact of Importance concerning the Reign of *Philip the Tall*, or *Charles the Handsome*. When the Treaty of Alliance between the Kings of *France* and *Scotland* was renewed, they added a very material Article, which Father † *Daniel* relates in these Terms ; “ If it should happen that either of the two Kings should die, and leave the Right of Inheritance of the Crown uncertain, in such case the Lawful Heir shall be adjudged, by the Chief Lords of the two Kingdoms, who shall declare to whom the Kingdom belongs ; after which, the other King shall not only hinder all Tyrants from usurping the Kingdom lately in Dispute, but if need be, shall Personally with a great Power defend the Lawful Heir, &c. The Margin quotes a Manuscript of *Bethune*, in the Royal Library, Vol. mark'd 9687. This is a Spring I cannot go to, but however, should be very glad to know if that Historian had any credible Authority for mentioning the renewing of the Alliance, in the Year 1324. and for attributing the Addition made to it at that time, to the wise and singular Foresight of *Charles the Handsome*. After having said at the End of the History of that Prince, that his Widow being deliver'd of a Daughter, the Crown belong'd to *Philip de Valois*, he adds, “ But still *Edward* opposed

† Tom. 2. col. 436.

" pos'd him. Charles had foreseen *them*; and for
" that reason, when the Alliance between the
" Kings of France and Scotland was renewed, in
" 1324. there was an Addition made to the an-
" cient Treaties of that which follows, If it
" should happen, &c.

That which makes me more inquisitive about this Point, is the Difference between Father Daniel and Mezerai concerning the Date and Design of the Addition : The latter places it in 1318. under the Reign of Philip the Tall. " The great danger (says he) France had been " in after the Death of *Hutin*, on account of a " doubtful Succession, and the cruel Wars that " had wasted Scotland upon almost a like occasi- " on, after the Death of King Alexander IV. [it " was Alexander III.] " were the Cause of adding " this conditional Article, when the Treaty of " Alliance between the two Crowns came to be " renewed, &c." His manner of expressing himself upon this Particular, shews plainly e- " nough, he has taken it from Spondens, who " owns he had it from the Scots, the French Au- " thors not having made the least mention of it. So that, properly speaking, the Dispute lies be- " tween Spondens and Father Daniel. I could have wish'd, this Piece of History, so material in it self, and, which besides, may some time or o- " ther be of service to the two Nations (since they have never retracted that Agreement) had not escaped M. *le Gentre*; and that he had clea- " red up this Difference between Father Daniel and Spondens, whom Mezerai has followed.
As Spondens quotes the 14th Book of the His- " tory of Scotland by Boethius, I have examined the Book, and find, three French Historians have o-
mitted

mitted some curious Circumstances, which are, * that to render the Agreement between the two Nations perpetual, they sealed it with the Sacrament, and a solemn Oath. Moreover, they got it approv'd by the Pope. What a pity was it to see the Kings of *France* and *Scotland* beginning their Treaties, might have the Approbation of the Bishop of *Rome*, who of right had as little Authority in their Dominions as the Bishop of *Mazza* has in the Great *Mogul's Empire*. Nevertheless there was this Clause added, that let the Pope do what he would, it should not be in his power to release the two Nations from that Oath. I could not discover from *Boethius* the Date of this Agreement; but it seems to concur with that in Father *Daniel*; because immediately after he mentions *Edward* the Second's Imprisonment by Queen *Isabella* his Wife, which happen'd in the Reign of *Charles the Handsome*. *Buchanan* says the same thing; but mangles this Point: For he relates the New Article added to the Old Alliances; as if it regarded † *Scotland* alone: Whereas it was reciprocally for both Kingdoms. 'Tis very likely, the Manuscript of *Bethune* quoted by Father *Daniel*, may have given some light into the date of the Addition.

I

* Quæ ut apud posteros etiam rata essent, sumptœ Sacrofagi^o
Chriſti corpore, jurejurando ea utriusque confirmarunt, & à Pon-
tifice probanda curarunt. Adjutum præterea ne unquam ab eo
jurejurando, per Pontificem Romanum liberari posſent, aut si
id effet factum irritum foret. Scot. Hist. l. 14. fol. 306, 307.

† Ad veteres conditiones adjutum, ut si quando de Succes-
uo Regi apud Scotos ambigeretur, ea controverſia ab Ordinum
confilio decideretur: qui illic legitimis suffragiis Rex effet de-
claratus, eum auctoritate & armis, si opus effet, Gallus tueri-
tur. Rer. Scot. lib. 8.

I don't know whether this famous Historian owes to that Manuscript what he relates, how Charles the Handsome forefaw the Opposition King Edward III. afterwards made to Philip de Valois's Pretensions to the Succession, and for that reason procur'd the additional Agreement before mentioned, to the ancient Treaties between Scotland and France. But I think, this giving Charles Credit for more Sagacity than he had a right to. There does not seem to be the least likelihood, that a King like him, at the Age of Thirty Years only, should think of Death, or of means to prevent the Disputes which might arise between the Princes of his Blood, in case he should die without Male Issue. I should扇e my self nearer the Truth, if I should say, he minded nothing else than how to prevent that Case ever happening, by leaving a good Number of such Children. It was with this View, that soon after his Accession to the Crown he contracted a second Marriage with Mary of Luxembourg. She brought him a Son, who (says Froissart) died very young, and the Lady presently after, at Issoudun in Berry, both very suspiciously, of which certain Persons were secretly accused." Mezerai says, the Mother died before the Son; but in that *Hailan* and Father *Daniel* follow the contemporary Author. Mezerai and Father *Daniel* say, the Queen miscarried. The latter varies from *du Hailan* and *Froissart*, by insinuating that she did not die so very quickly after the Child. Always Variations! Charles lost no time in endeavouring to get Sons: he married the third time, Jane d'Eureux, his Cousin-German, the same Year in which Father *Daniel* makes him renew the Alli-

ance with *Scotland*, in 1324. By her he had one Daughter; and when he died, left her seven months gone with Child. All this makes it reasonable to conclude, that he was quite otherwise employed, than in amusing himself with the Thoughts how to prevent the possible Opposition of *Edward*, at that time a Child about twelve Years old only, to the Pretensions of *Philip de Valois* to the Crown of *France*, in case he (*Charles*) should die without Issue-Male; and the more, because at that time there was so little room to believe that would be the Case. Death is seldom or never thought of at such a distance in the Flower of Youth, especially by a King, and when the Business is nothing more than to secure the Succession to a Collateral Branch.

THE END OF THE THIRD PART.

卷之三

PART

PART IV.



HE Subject I am going upon, is in the main the most considerable and moving Part of the Dissertation I have undertaken to examine. It concerns the Third Instance, wherein the *Salick Law* was exemplified in the * Person of *Philip Earl of Valois*, to the Exclusion of *Edward III. King of England*. “*Charles the Handsome* (says M. *de Verret*, p. 345.) as well as the Two Kings his Brothers, had but one Daughter. The Crown, in this Vacancy belonged to *Philip de Valois*, Son of *Charles Earl of Valois*, Brother to *Philip the Handsome*, Father of the Three last Kings. *Philip*, besides these Three Sons, had a Daughter called

* *Mererai* is mistaken, in beginning his History of *France* the First after this manner : “*This is the third time in the Capetien Family, that the Scepter, for want of Male Issue in a direct Line, hath passed to the Collateral Branch.*” He ought to have said, the fifth time : For it had happened before in the same Family. First, in *Philip the Tall*. Secondly, in *Charles the Handsome*. Thirdly, in *Philip de Valois*; and Fourthly, in *Lewis XII.*

" led * *Isabella*, married to *Edward II.* King of *England*, from whom sprang *Edward III.* This young Prince soon claimed the Crown, as being *Isabella's Son*. The Englishman did not directly attack the *Salick Law*, or that ancient Custom of admitting none but the Male Issue of the House in Possession ; but he supposed, that being himself of the Male Sex, neither the Exclusion of the Queen his Mother ; nor even the Words of the *Salick Law* could do him any prejudice ; and that being Nephew to the late King, to whom *Philip de Valois* was but Cousin-German, he had besides the Agreement of the Sex, the Advantage of being nearer of kin by one Degree."

To do the Author justice, he sets forth *Edw ard's Pretensions* with as much Perspicuity and Exactness as Brevity, excepting one Word, which I only take notice of for the greater Accuracy. The Englishman, says he, did not directly attack the *Salick Law* ; *Directly* is a Word too much. I have shewn at large in the First Part, that *Edward* did not attack the *Salick Law* directly nor indirectly ; and that it was no less his own Concern, than the Interest of *Philip de Valois*, to maintain it. 'Twas their common Bottom : Neither one nor the other could have any shadow of Right to the Crown of *France*, but in consequence of this Principle, That the Female Sex was excluded from it, since at that time there were living Daughters of every one

* *De Serres*, so remarkably fruitful in Blunders, forgetting he call'd her *Isabella*, gives her the Name of *Margaret* in two other Places, and makes her Aunt of *Charles the Handsome* ; whereas she was his Sister.

of the Three last Kings, the Queen of *England's* Brothers : Nay, there were no less than Seven of them, as I have made appear towards the End of the Third Part ; for *Lewis Huit* left One, *Philip the Tall Four*, and *Charles the Handsome Two*. See Pages 91, 92.

Of all the Six Instances produced in *MadeVertor's* Dissertation, this is beyond Comparison the most material, and the only one that can conceth any Body at this present time. It is no matter whether the Daughters of *Childeric*, *Cherebert* and *Gomtran*, were justly or unjustly laid aside. The Descendant's of the Daughter of *Lewis*, surnam'd *Huit*, have for more than an Age past been in Possession of the Crown, from which Custom, having the Force of a Law, had excluded her, by reason of her Sex. After *Charles the Handsome*, she was Queen of *Navarre* in her own Right, and became the Stock of all the Kings and Queens that have Reign'd there since. Thus her Posterity came to the Crown of *France* in the Person of *Henry IV.* one of her Descendants by that King's Mother, *Jane of Albert* Queen of *Navarre*. As for the Daughters of *Philip the Tall* and *Charles the Handsome*, their Line is either totally extinct, or the Remainder incorporated into the House now reigning. The Five first Instances had no unhappy Influence upon the State ; but the Sixth gave birth to a Quarrel which brought on most bloody Wars, and often reduced *France* to the last Gasp ; the Remembrance whereof continues fresh to this Day, and in all likelihood will never be forgotten. King *Edward's* Successors have ever since, as he did, taken the Title of Kings of *France*, with the Arms of that Kingdom;

dom ; nor is there any room to believe there will ever be a Monarch of *Great Britain* willing to fulfil the Promise, 'tis said, *James II.* made in his Retreat to *Lewis XIV.* in relation to this Point of Honour.

This is what makes me wonder that *M. de Verrois* says nothing positively of the very grounds of the Dispute between *Edward* and *Philip de Valois*. Would it have been too hard a Task for him to refute the Arguments of the *Englishman*, as he calls him, after he had so clearly summ'd up the Substance of them ? Was it through Impossibility of succeeding, that laying aside the Point of *Rights*, he confines himself to the Matter of *Fiat* only, and is satisfy'd with a bare Relarion out of *Froissart*, how the Peers and Barons cut the Knot of a Question of that Consequence ; and which, as the Dissertation says, *attracted the Eyes of all Europe*? There is no need to transcribe the Passage from that Historian, it will suffice to say, that one finds in it, First, The Three Marches of *Charles the Handsome*, who died without Male Issue, but leaving his Queen big with Child. Secondly, The Disposition he made on his Death-Bed, by appointing *Philip de Valois* Regent of the Kingdom, in case his Wife should have a Son, and referring to the Great Men to determine whose the Crown should be, in case she should be brought to Bed of a Daughter. In the third Place, the Meeting of the Peers and Barons after the Queen had brought a Daughter, and their Judgement in favour of the Earl of *Valois*. " They assembled at *Paris* as soon as they could, and with one Consent gave the King-dom to *Philip de Valois*, and excluded both the Queen of *England*, Sister to the late King *Char-* " *les* "

" *les* and the King her Son ; because, as they said, the Crown of *France* was of too great Dignity to be inherited by the Female Sex.

I have too good an Opinion of M. *de Verot*, to think him capable of relishing an Argument so little to the Purpose, the Question not being, Whether a Woman should succeed to the Crown of *France* ? and moreover, so frivolous in it self. I am persuaded, he cannot fansie that those Monarchies which admit the Female Sex to their Crowns, ought to yield in *Dignity* to those which exclude them ; therefore it seems very odd, he has not subjoin'd, if he could, something more substantial to the Reason given by the French Peers for their Decision ; and which may be, *Froissart* brings in but in Raillery. For my part, who think the Right was on *Edward's* side, I shall shew upon what Foundation I go.

Not only the Text of the *Salick Law* could not prejudice King *Edward*, as M. *de Verot* is contented to make that Prince say ; but even that very Text declares it self necessarily in his Favour. *The next Male shall succeed*, says that Law in so many Words ; it is express'd in general Terms, without fixing to any particular degree of Proximity ; without specifying that the next Male requir'd, must be in a descent from Male to Male. Since then it does not determine in this particular Sence, 'tis but natural to understand it according to the common acceptation of the Words, *The next Male*, whether by the Male or Female side, without Distinction. Who is it, that by the next Male Kindred of a Man that has no Sons, but a Grandson by a Daughter, would not understand that Grandson ? Who could ever think to look for the next Male in

in a Collateral Person, such as a Brother, Nephew or Cousin, unless he was bound by Custom, or some Law or Sentence, having by way of Presumption the force of a Law? But there was nothing of all this against *Edward*.

No Custom in opposition to his Right. Baron *Puffendorf* reports, that not one single Example, anterior to this Dispute, can be produced; that a Son of a King of *France's* Brother, as *Philip de Valois* was, had ever been admitted to the Succession, to the prejudice of a Grandson by a Daughter, as King *Edward* was. This is a very material Point, and 'tis pretty extraordinary, that Father *Daniel* should venture to say, "That by a Custom immemorial of the Nation, the Children of the Daughters of *France*, had never been look'd upon as presumptive Heirs to the Crown ; and this Custom (adds he very boldly) " shews the Sence of the Salick Law. Before this famous Historian could have any Pretence to speak with this Assurance, he ought to have brought some Instances prior to *Edward*; but he quotes none. We have just now seen that *Puffendorf* affirms, not one single Instance could be given in the Case before us. I have run over all the Collateral Successions of the First and Second Families ; (for as for the Third till *Philip the Tall*, the Crown always descended from Father to Son;) and I do not find in any of those Successions, that the nearest of Kin by the Female side, was ever excluded to make way for a more distant Descendant from Male to Male. Whenever, therefore, Father *Daniel*, or any other for him, shall have given any Proof of what he advances, we shall be bound to believe him ; but till then, every just and unbiass'd

unbias'd Reader will be surprized at his supposing so gratis a Custom immemorial, in order to conclude from thence, that it plainly demonstrates the Sence of the Salick Law, in opposition to King Edward's Pretensions.

To say with Justice, that by Custom immemorial such a thing has not been done in a Kingdom, 'tis not sufficient, that it has not been practised; but the Practice must have been refused, when the Occasion offer'd. For Example; No Woman had reigned in *England*, from the time of the Romans till the Death of Henry I. commonly called *Beaucherk* for his Learning. If any one at that time would have disputed the Natural Right of Succession, with the † Empress *Maud* Countess of *Anjou*, and Eldest Daughter to Henry I. who died without Male Issue; could he with any decency have argued, as F. Daniel does, *That by a Custom immemorial of the English Nation the Daughters of England had never been look'd upon as presumptive Heiresses of the Crown?* He would, without doubt, have been answered, that what he said amounted to nothing, unless he could prove that the Daughters of *England* had been excluded from the Crown, when by Birth-right they ought to have

P 2
have

† *Steph'n* Earl of *Blis*, and Son of King Henry's Sister, found means to get into the Throne, by bringing People to swear that King Henry had dis-inherited his Daughter, altho' he had caused her to be acknowledged as Heiress to him in his Life-time. This occasioned a long Civil War between *Maud* and *Steven*; at length the Matter was compromised thus, That *Steven*, who had lost his Son *Eustace*, should enjoy the Crown for his Life, and make *Henry* his Successor; which was faithfully perform'd; so that *Henry* came to the Crown after *Steven's* Death, who was his Uncle, according to the Use of *Bretany*, as the French say, *à la mode de Bretagne*.

have enjoy'd it, had not their Sex stood in the way. *Edward* had no Instances to produce in his Favour, no more than *Philip de Valois*, yet for all that, they were not upon an Equality, there was this great Difference to *Edward's* Advantage, that by Birth he was invested with the Title of *The next Male*. If then it was pretended, notwithstanding his Birth, that Title did not belong to him in the Sence of the Law, and with respect to the Succession, because Custom contradicted it, some Examples ought according to all Rules, to be given where the Princes born of the Daughters of *France*, had been deprived of the Right of succeeding in Cases like his; or if not specifically the same, yet of the same kind: so that as to this Point, *Edward* was upon much better terms than *Philip*. He was naturally invested with the Right inherent in the first Prince of the Blood, being so by his Birth. If therefore *Philip* had a Mind to divest him of that Right, by a Custom which defeated it, he ought to have proved such Custom, by Instances adapted to the Point in Dispute.

In default of such Custom, was there any Law, or Sentence carrying the force of a Law, by way of Presumption, which could interpret the *Salick Law* to King *Edward's* Prejudice? No, there is not the least Sign of any. When the Daughter of *Lewis*, Surnam'd *Huitin*, claim'd the Crown, her Uncle put the Custom in Execution against her, which had been follow'd for excluding the Daughters as often as a King happened to die without Issue-Male; as may be seen in the Histories of *Childebert*, *Cherebert* and *Gontran*. The Earl of *Poitou* alledged farther the Article *de Alodis* in the *Salick Law*. This Article

Article was admitted, whether rightly or no, is not to our present purpose; admitted it was, as a Rule for governing the Succession to the Crown, at least by way of Application and Consequence: Thus Custom and the *Salick Law* set the Brother of *Lewis Hutin* upon the Throne, passing by his Daughter; because Custom and that Law, whether well or ill understood or applied, concurr'd or were thought to concur, in establishing the Right of the Males, and excluding the Female Sex. But it went no farther; there was nothing said of the manner how the Person ought to be descended from the Royal Blood, who is to be look'd upon as the next Male, and by consequence invested with the Right of Succession according to the Terms of the *Salick Law*. This Question was still in its first State *in integrō*, as we say: There had been nothing determin'd, that could do against King Edward's Case.

It was therefore this Prince's Right to succeed, since he was the *next Male*. This Qualification naturally belong'd to him, and was apparently supported by the Civil Law, without Custom, Law, or Sentence suppling the Place of a Law, or forming any Presumption that could withstand or destroy it. The Civil Law, and whatever we call the Law of Nature, have nothing to do in matters that have been once decided by a National Law: But as long as that is silent, the other Two are to be observed. Now the National Law of *France* had determined nothing that could make against *Edward*. It follows then there was nothing that could hinder him from enjoying a Right which came to him by Nature, and was back'd by the Civil Laws:

Laws: For who is so blind, as not to discern, That both Nature and the Civil Laws teach us to look upon *Edward* as nearer of kin to *Philip the Handsom*, being his Grandson, than *Philip de Valois*, who was only his Nephew : He was consequently more nearly related to the late King *Charles the Handsome*, being his Nephew; whereas *Philip de Valois* was only his Cousin German.

All that is here brought against *Edward*, may be reduced to this ; That the Exclusion of the Daughters of *France* implies that of their Children, tho' of the Masculine Sex. “ The King of *England* (lays Father *Daniel*) could have no Right to the Crown of *France* by his Mother, that Princess neither having, nor being capable of having any.” “ How (says M. le *Gendre*) how can the Mother, said they, transmit to her Children a Right which she never had her self ? ” This is what the Civilian *Baldus* expresses after this manner : “ If the King of *France's* Daughter, by a reasonable Custom amongst the *French*, does not succeed to the Crown, the King of *England* her Son, can have no Claim to it, since † there cannot be greater Virtue in the Effect, than what proceeds from the influencing Power of the Cause.”

This way of reasoning may be concluding in things purely Physical ; but is a mere Paralogism in Civil Matters. For Instance ; A Fo reigner in *England*, altho' he be naturalized, he still remains depriv'd of certain Immunities : But

+ *Quia in consueto non potest esse plus virtutis quam praeedit ab influenti potentia cause.* Spond. ad an. 1528.

But whether naturaliz'd or not, his Children will enjoy them if they are born within the Kingdom. In all Nations an Ideot is incapable of holding an Office hereditary to the Family: But this is no Bar to keep his Son, who may have a sound Understanding, from enjoying it. Now, let this Maxim, *That the Effect cannot have what is not to be found in the Cause,* be applied if it can, to Instances of this kind. The Right of Succession to the Crown of France was inherent in the Blood of the reigning Family, to the Exclusion, however, of the Female Sex. Edward had received from his Mother that Blood, which (he being Male) qualified him to succeed, and by consequence transmitted to him the Right of Succession, altho' she had it not her self; because in transmitting that Blood to him, she did not communicate her exclusive Quality, *viz.* the Female Sex. He was the next Male, which she never was, nor could be. This is what he says in his Letter to the Pope, as I have related it after Wallingham in the first Part of these Remarks. p. 23. A strong Presumption, that before the Decision in favour of Philip, the Exclusion of a Son was not necessarily comprehended in that of the Mother, is, that as Froissart reports in the Passage quoted by M. de Vertot, Charles the Handsome freely appointed Philip Regent of the Kingdom, if the Child wherewith his Wife was big, should prove a Son. Mezerai says likewise, it was talk'd, the King had by his Will ordained, that in such a Case Philip should be Regent of the Kingdom, and have the Guardianship of the Child. Father Daniel expressly confirms what relates to the Regency. But Charles

Charles took care not to name Philip for his Successor, for, in case the Queen should have a Daughter. On the contrary, Froissart makes that King say on his Death bed, That if the latter happen'd, the Twelve Peers and High Barons of France should take Counsel, advise amongst themselves, and confer the Kingdom on whomsoever in Justice it belonged to. Would he after this manner have referr'd the Decision of the Succession to the Peers and Barons, if he had imagin'd, the Exclusion of the Daughters of France decreed in favour of his Brother Philip the Tall, and since practised in his own Person, did indispensably take in the Exclusion of such Male Issue as should be born of them? Ought he not to have acknowledg'd Philip as his Successor, if the Queen should not have a Son? He shew'd enough his good Will to him, by naming him Regent, in case the Posthumous Child should be a Son; and, no doubt, his Inclinations would have been to appoint him his Successor also, if it should happen otherwise, had he been persuaded, that the Exclusion of Women implied that of their Sons, with regard to the Right of inheriting the Crown: For if that were taken for granted, Philip de Valois must have succeeded without any more to do.

But setting aside this Presumption, so strong in Edward's Favour, there are convincing Proofs of Fact against the Philosophical Principle made use of in opposition to him. They are to be met with in the Examples of Athalarick and Theodatus; which I have set forth after M. de Vertot, in the First Part. These two Anglo-Norman Princes reigned in right of their Birth; one of them as Grandson, the other as Nephew to

to the Great Theodorick; but were Descendants however of Women excluded from the Crown by reason of their Sex. *Abalarick* succeeded his Grandfather at the Age of Eight or Ten Years; so that his Mother *Amalasonia*, *Theodoric's* Daughter, was no more than Regent of the Kingdom. After *Abalarick's* Death, *Theodorus* slept into the Throne, as Son to *Amalafrida* *Theodoric's* Sister.

Here are Two Princesses, *Amalasonia* and *Amalafrida*, who transmitted to their Sons a Right which they themselves never had. Therefore it is not true, that the Exclusion of the Mother necessarily excludes the Children: The Practice of the *Ostrogoths*, demonstrates the contrary. These Instances have so much the greater Weight, that the French Writers bring them to prove, the *Goths* never admitted Women to the Royalty, and to shew by that means in general, the Temper of the Barbarous Nations in this respect: From whence they have drawn a Consequence for the ancient *Franks* in particular. According to this way of arguing, made use of by *Pajquier, du Chefne* and *M. de Vertot*, as may be seen in the First Part of these Remarks, it must also be said, that the ancient *Franks*, in putting the Daughters of their Kings by the Throne, never designed to deprive the Male Issue of those Daughters; since the History of the *Ostrogoths* shew a quite contrary Practice.

Now, let all the Arguments in favour of *Edward*, Grandson to *Philip* the Handsome, and Nephew of the Three last Kings, be put together, and well consider'd: He was apparently the next *Male*, and consequently the true Heir, designed by the very Terms of the *Salick Law*, ad-

admitted as a Standard for regulating the Succession ever since the Accession of *Philip* the Tall to the Crown ; there having never been Either Example, or Law, or Sentence supplying the Place of a Law, and making a Presumption, or, in a Word, any thing that might oppose his Enjoyment of a Right inseparable from the next Male to the Royal Blood. Besides, The last King *Charles the Handsome* was sensible of the Strength of *Edward's* Right, since notwithstanding his good Will to *Philip de Valois*, he was unwilling to burthen his Conscience, by acknowledging that Earl for his Successor. Lastly, The King of *England* had the Examples of the *Oftrogorts* on his side. Let all these Particulars be examined with the same Candor and Impartiality, as if it concerned but a *Japanese* Prince ; and then let any one judge, whether Father *Daniel* had reason to say, *That Edward knew perfectly well, that his Claims to the Crown of France were very Chimerical.* Tom. 2. Col. 567. M. *le Gendre* does not speak in so satirical and scornful a stile : He contents himself with saying gently, *That Philip's Right seemed to be the best* ; and does not even scruple to put among the Causes which inclined the Peers to determine in *Philip's* Favour, *his powerful Friends, their Cabals and great Credit.* Could there be occasion for all this, against a Right, the Extravagance of which must have appeared to all the World, had he, whose Business it was to maintain it, known it to be very chimerical ? Father *Daniel* will not take it amiss, that I oppose to him Baron *Pfendorf*, whose excellent Works upon the Law of Nature and Nations, shew of what weight his Judg.

Judgment ought to be in Matters of this kind. M. *le Gendre* will not say that *England* see'd him well for it, as he does of the Lawyers who gave their Opinion in *Edward's* favour; without reflecting that those who were for *Philip*, were no less liable to the same Reflection: Neither was he one of those Fugitives for Religion, who were forced by cruel Persecutions to sacrifice all that was valuable to them in their own Country for Conscience sake, and so might be suspected of being influenc'd thro' Gratitude or Policy, rather than by the Reasons of manifest Justice, to engage in the Interests of those Nations where Providence had provided them with a favourable Retreat; so far is it from this * Excellent Writer's being on any Account liable to Suspicion by *France*, that he seems more inclined to favour her than any other Nation, *Sweden* excepted, and yet he determines clearly in favour of *Edward*.

" † *Philip de Valois* (says he in his Chapter of *France*) " appealed to the *Salick Law*, which excludes the Females from the Succession; but on the other Hand, *Edward* without denying that Law, pleaded, that it did not extend to the Sons born of the Daughters of *France*, and it was certain he was nearer akin to the ceas'd King, than *Philip*; besides, there could not any Precedent be brought, where a Son of a King's Daughter had been excluded, to admit a Brother's Son: However, in spite of all these Reasons, the Estates of France declar'd for

* See the Praises given him in the *Method for reading History*. Tom. I. p. 64.

† See Translation of his Introduction to History. Ch. 5. § 9.

" for Philip ; partly upon the strong Perswasions of
 " Robert Earl of Artois, and partly because they
 " did not care France shoud become subject to
 " England. The States of England (adds he
 a little after) " exhorted Edward not to let drop
 " his just and well-grounded Pretensions so tamely.
 He had said before in the Chapter of England,
 " Philip de Valois prevailed by the favour of the
 " Estates, notwithstanding he was a degree far-
 " ther off, as being but Son to the Brother of
 " the late King's Father, *under pretence of the*
 " Salick Law, and out of the hatred they bore
 " to a Foreign Sovereign.

This last Article is unquestionably the Reason
 why Edward was excluded ; nay, there are some
 French Historians who make no scruple of telling
 us so plainly. " || Above all other Kings (says
 " du Haillan) the French loved and honoured
 " this new King, (*Philip de Valois*) saying, he
 " was the Revenger of the Affront the Foreign-
 " ers design'd to offer the Crown of France, and
 " the Restorer of the *Salick Law* ; as he that
 " had re-established *France* in her ancient Pre-
 " rogative, by Virtue of the said Law, which
 " was the Support of the Liberty and Dignity
 " of *France* ; preventing the *French*, who were
 " wont to give Laws and Kings to other Nati-
 " ons, from falling under the Yoke, Servitude,
 " and Dominion of Foreign Powers." *Mezerai*
 in plain Terms mentions the Aversion the *French*
 had to a Foreign Sovereign, as one of the
 motives to the decision against *Edward* ; and *M.
 le Gendre*, to crown all the rest, takes notice of
 their hatred to the English Government. There is
 no

o doubt then to be made but that *Edward*, Grandson of King *Philip* the Handsome, would have been preferr'd to *Philip*, his Grandfather's Nephew, had he been no more than Earl of *Yar-*
ris, and his Competitor King of *England*; without flinging into the Ballance his Personal Merit, which made him so much admir'd, that even the French Authors cannot avoid giving him the most glorious Encomiums.

M. de *Vertot* makes some Remarks upon the Passage he quotes out of *Froissart*, that do not at all concern the Dispute between *Edward* and *Philip*. He begins them thus; “ By this plain, natural, and candid Relation, one may see, the King was oblig'd by the Peers and Barons to put away his first Wife, in hopes of having a Male and Presumptive Heir to the Crown. Shall only take notice of two small Irregularities in the Style of this Expression, a *Male and Presumptive Heir of the Crown*: This Expression, *Male Heir*, methinks, in this Place is very improper; could the Female Sex have inherited Charles's Crown, it might have been properly used, but even then there must have been a Daughter living at that time. In that Case, the Peers might have press'd the King to take another Wife, out of a desire of having a *Male Heir*; but that Distinction is utterly useless where the Crown is inheritable only by the Male Line. This Impropriety is originally owing to *Froissart*; * but when the old Word *boir* was chang'd, that of *male*, ought to have been suppress'd.

To

* This Remark is not so well adapted to the English as the French Tongue.

To this Impropriety the Author adds another of his own, which is that of the Word *presumptive*, out of a desire, says he, of having a *Male* and *Presumptive Heir* of the Crown. This Term *presumptive* is not rightly placed here, for according to the Definition of it, given by the French Academy, a Presumptive Heir is one who is look'd upon to be the next Heir, but so however, as that he may be excluded by the Intervention of Children. Thus in a *Male Kingdom*, in one may so call it, as we say a *Male Fief*, the Title of Presumptive Heir is only applicable to a Prince who stands first in the Order of Succession in the Collateral Line; if then *Charles* the Handsome had had a Son, that Son would have been the *absolute* not the *presumptive* Heir of the Crown; for no Child could have come between him and the Crown. In those Kingdoms where Daughters succeed, the Eldest Daughter of the Prince upon the Throne, is no more than *presumptive* Heiress, altho' she has no Brother, so long as one may be born, which would deprive her of the Quality of Heiress. I know a great many confound an Absolute Heir, who is yet only in Expectation of the Succession, with a Presumptive Heir, but 'tis through a habit of speaking without Reflection.

" *Charles* the Handsome (continues *M. de Verret*)
 " perceiving he drew near his End, referr'd the
 " Decision of the several Princes Pretensions to
 " the Crown, to the High Barons. The States
 " did not assemble, the Peers and Barons only,
 " determin'd that Matter in favour of *Philip de
 " Valois.*" I make no doubt but he has done
 better in following *Froissart* upon this Circum-
 stance, as *Spondens*, *Mezrai*, and Father *Daniel*
 have

have done, than those who mention the States, as *du Haillan*, *de Serres*, *Puffendorf*, *Moreri*, *M. de Brianville*, and *M. le Gendre*. Nay, *du Haillan* formally names a *solemn Assembly* of the Prelates, Nobility and People, *whicoh* (adds he) make the Three Estates. This is contrary to Father Daniel's Opinion, which I have taken notice of in the 76th. Page; he pretends, the States of *France* did not consist of those Three Bodies, till the Reign of King *John*, Son of *Philip de Valois*, who succeeded *Charles the Handsome*. That which makes me apt to believe that the States General were not conven'd upon the Dispute between *Edward* and the Earl of *Valois* about the Right of Succession, is, that *Pasquier* says nothing of it in his Enquiry after the Original of the States General; according to his reckoning, their Beginning, altho' very imperfect, was under *Philip the Handsome*: He recites the occasion; after which, the first Example he produces of a General Assembly of the Three States, properly so called, was not till the Reign of King *John*, at which there was granted an additional Duty upon Salt, call'd *Læ Gabelle*, first imposed, as he says, by his Father *Philip*.

Is it likely *Pasquier*, whose Business it was to write the History of the General States, could be capable of overlooking an Assembly that made the greatest noise, and was the most considerable of the kind, that ever was in the Kingdom of *France*? Were the General States ever called together upon so important an Affair, as the Dispute between the King of *England* and the Earl of *Valois*? I have shewn before, that *Pasquier* might be mistaken, as well as another Man: But here is something particular in this Case,

Case, that makes his silence a very strong Negative Proof; which is, his having *ex prof *examined the History of the General States from their Beginning.**

One cannot sufficiently wonder at the difference between Historians upon the nature of a Assembly, which determined a Dispute, b M. de Vertor very justly called, *An Affair of great moment, and which attracted the Eyes of Europe.* 'Tis also very surprizing, they should not agree upon the time of that Assembly *Froissart* dates it from the Queen's Delivery " Soon after (says he) King Charles dy'd, about Easter, in the Year 1327. (*he is mistaken for it was on the first of February,*) " Queen Jane was brought to bed of a fine Daughter; " and then the Twelve Peers and Barons assembled at Paris." However, *du Haillan, de Serres, and M. le Gendre* make the States come together whilst the Queen was big, and confer the Regency of the Kingdom, with the Guardianship of her Issue, upon Philip, adjudging the Crown to belong to him, in case the Child should prove a Daughter: so that according to their way of reckoning, he had nothing to do, but take possession of the Throne whenever that should be the Case. *Mezerai* does not cut out so much Work for the Peers and Barons at one time. He assembles them immediately upon *Charles's* death; and says, they presently conferred the Regency and Guardianship upon Philip: But as to the Succession, according to him, they did not settle it till the Queen was deliver'd: So that he makes two distinct Assemblies. Father Daniel follows him; but *Spondens* is of an Opinion quite different from all the former. He

He says, the Peers and Great Men being affembled upon the Dispute between *Philip* and *Edward* for the Regency of the Kingdom, scarce had they begun to speak of it, but the Queen was brought to Bed of a Daughter; so that they had nothing left to do, but to settle the Succession. Pray, which of all these are we to believe?

They differ likewise about the Day on which *Philip* was crowned. *Du Haillan* and *Spondens* say, that it was on *Trinity-Sunday*, without naming the Day of the Month; *Doms Germain Miller* and Father *Daniel*, say it was on the Twenty seventh of *May*, without naming the Day of the very Week; *Meserai* and M. *Vallmont* say, it was on *Trinity-Sunday*, and the Twenty eighth of *May*; M. *Briantville* says, it was on that Sunday, and *May* the Twenty ninth; according to *Calvissius* it was on *Whitsunday* and the Thirty first of *May*. But M. *Briantville* alone is in the right; for as one may see in *Calvissius*, in the Year 1328. the Golden Number was 18. and the Dominical Letters C. B. Therefore *Easter* fell on the Third of *April*, and consequently *Trinity-Sunday* on the Twenty ninth of *May*. *Calvissius* makes here three Mistakes; setting, 1st, the Year 1327. for 1328. not considering the first was ended at Easter; 2^{dly}, *Whitsunday* for *Trinity-Sunday*; 3^{dy}, the 3rd of *May* for the 29th. He quotes the Annals of Flanders, which I cannot come at.

Here is the following Part of M. *de Verot's* Reflections upon the Passage out of *Froissart*. "I leave it to those who shall read these Facts, to draw from them such Consequences as they think fit; I only take notice, that our Peers and Barons being the Defenders of the Crown and its Domain, took it very ill afterwards, that St. *Lewis*, religiously infatuated with

" Holy

R

" Holy-Land Voyages, should offer to pawn
" Normandy to Henry III. King of England, in
" order to enable him to perform, or at least,
" not to be crossed in that Expedition.

" Matthew Paris, a Contemporay English Hi-
" storian, (and the best we have for Matters of
" the 13th Century) reports, that the Great
" Men of the Kingdom oppos'd it with much
" Resolution. There was (says this Author) an
" horrible Murmuring amongst the Nobles, who
" complained of the King's undertaking such an
" Affair, without the Knowledge and Consent
" of all the Baronage.

" And to shew the Peers are comprehended in
" that Peerage, or Baronage, the highest Title
" which in those Days the Nobility affected, he
" makes Good St. Lewis, in a Letter to the King
" of England upon that Subject, express himself
" thus: || *I wish to God the Twelve Peers of France,
and the Baronage were of my Opinion; we should
be then united in an indissoluble Band of Friendship.*"
There are several Remarks to be made upon
these three short Paragraphs. First, I find an *An-*
chronism of near Four score Years. St. Lewis was
Great Grandfather to Philip de Valois; Henry III.
was also Great Grandfather to Edward. The Pas-
sage which the Author had in view, and which
he represents as happening *after* the Judgment in
favour of Philip, given in 1328, was Three-
score and seventeen Years before; for it bears
Date in 1252, according to *Matth. Paris*, whom
he quotes in the Dissertation. This Mistake is
the more remarkable, in that M. *de Verror* says,
a few Lines after, that he is one of the best His-
torians for Matters of the 13th Century. And
again,

|| *O utinam duodecim Pares Francie & Baronum miki con-*
sentirent, certe amici effimus indissolubiles.

again, in the Beginning of the following Dissertation upon the Holy Vial, that *Matthew Paris* lived in the middle of the 13th Century. Now the Dispute between *Edward* and *Philip de Valois* was not till the first Quarter of the 14th Century was fully expir'd.

Secondly, The Author is in the wrong to say, *Lewis* would have pawn'd Normandy to *Henry III.* King of *England*: The business was, to restore it absolutely, together with other Countries in *France*, which *Henry* pretended a Right to. The Murmuring of the Great Men proceeded from the Order sent by *St. Lewis* from beyond the Seas, where he was at that time, to make restitution thereof. The *French*, says *Matt. Paris*, gave a bold Answer to their Prince's Order to restore to the King of *England* the Lands on the other side of the Water. *God forbid*, &c.

What I have said concerning the Place where *St. Lewis* was, discovers a third Mistake in the manner of this Author's expressing the Motives which influenc'd that King. "Religious infatuated," says he, with Holy Land-Voyages, he "had a mind to pawn Normandy to King *Henry III.* of *England*, in order to raise a Supply to enable him to perform, or at least, not to be cross'd in that Expedition." I have nothing to say to the Religious Infatuation he imputes to *St. Lewis*. I wish, for his sake, every body would take the Jest as well as I do. But I am afraid, he will be put to the necessity of writing such another Dissertation as he has done upon the Holy Vial of *St. Remy*, to atone for the liberty he has taken, of calling that an Infatuation, which the † Gods here below would have to be

† The Popes were the chief Promoters of that *In-*

be esteemed as divine Zeal, and which, no question, was the great Motive for canonizing Lewis IX. Had it not been for these Holy Land-Voyages, of which M. *de Vertor* speaks so Cavalier-like, that Prince, in all likelihood, would have been only in the List of the Kings of France, without any other distinguishing Character than his Number, or at most, that of *good*, or *pious*; whereas 'tis by means of those Voyages, he is entitl'd to a Red Letter in the Calendar, and placed in the Catalogue of those, who in the *Roman Church* are look'd upon as Mediators of Intercession, even as a kind of + Redemers. Their Merits are offer'd to God, to obtain the Effects of his Goodness and Mercy; the * Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ is offered up to God in honour of them, in order to obtain their Intercession; they are called upon as Bestowers of all sorts of Graces & their Relicks and Images are religiouly worshipp'd, Vows and Offerings are made unto them, Oaths taken by their Names, and, in a Word, they are to Christians what the tutelar Gods were anciently to the Heathens. Can these divine Effects of Canonization, some will say, be the Reward of an *Infatuation*, however Religious it may be called? After all, what is a Religious

infatuation, and every one knows for what end.

+ Non absurdum erit, si simili viri Redemptores nostri aliquo modo dicantur. Bellarm. de indulgentiis, lib. 1. cap. 4. ad finem in Tomo 2.

* If any one shall say, 'tis an Imposture to celebrate Mass in honour of the Saints, and to obtain their Intercession with God, Let him be anathematized. *Canon of the Council of Trent, Of the Sacrifice of the Mass.* Sess. 22.

ligious Infatuation, but a sort of Religious Folly? Can a sort of Religious Folly then give a Man a Title to Canonization? M.^{de} *Vertot*, I confess, has a great deal of Wit; but I question whether all will be sufficient to help him over these Interrogations. But that is his Business: he may find such Excuses as he thinks fit, according to his own Words.

For my part, I shall observe, there is no one, but would judge, the King of *France* intended to strike the bargain with the King of *England*, mentioned by the Author, before his Religious Infatuation set him forward in his Expedition against the Infidels. Now, by the Date I have mention'd, it appears he had then been beyond the Seas four Years; for he set out in 1248. 'Twas from thence he gave Orders for restoring to King *Henry* several Countries, and at the same time made pressing Instances to that Prince to send him powerful Succours, of which he stood in great need, his Army having been defeated, and himself for some time Prisoner. In pursuance of this Order from *Lewis*, Embassadors were dispatch'd to *France* by King *Henry*, to demand the Execution of it, promising on his part to do whatever *Lewis* desir'd or requir'd of him. This was the Occasion, and consequently the time of the *horrible Murmuring* taken notice of by M.^{de} *Vertot*, after *Matth. Paris*. One may see it by the remaining part of the Passage, of which I have here inserted the Beginning. " † How desolate soever, said the Great Men of

[†] Non placet Deo ut nosris temporibus adeò sordeat *Francia*, militata licet plus quam satis est per Regulum nostrum ignavum & vixum, jam vilescat, ut Regi *Anglorum* imbelli quod possumat resignetur. Satis diffamatur, satis depauperamur. Et si

" of the Realm, *France* may be at present,
 " through the Fault of our pitiful King, whose
 " Defeat is owing to his little Valour, God
 " forbid we should add this Dishonour to the
 " rest, of yielding shamefully to the King of
 " *England's* Demands, before we are driven to
 " it by the Fortune of War. We are already
 " but too much impoverished and despised. In
 " vain will Queen *Blanche*, led to it by the
 " weakness of her Sex, and excited by her
 " Maternal Affection to obtain her Son's Li-
 " berty, and restore the unhappy Condition of
 " his Affairs, desire this. Never will the King-
 " dom of *France* submit to such Conditions.
 " Never will we consent that the Judgment of
 " the Twelve Peers, by which the King of
 " *England's* Pretensions are set aside, and by
 " which he has been lawfully divested of *Norman-*
 " *dy*, should be infring'd and disannulled. Nor shall
 " that Prince, our Capital Enemy, as long as we
 " live, ever obtain the rest of his Demands.
 " Upon which, (*this is M. de Vertor's Quotation*)
 " there arose a horrible murmuring amongst the
 " Great Men, who complained of the King's
 " undertaking such an Affair without the Knowl-
 " ledge or Consent of all the Baronage.
 A Fourth Mistake is, that M. *de Vertor* reports,
 as part of a Letter from *Lewis* to *Henry*, what
 he told him verbally, in a Personal Conference,
 and

" *velit Dominae Blanchie, hoc materno affectu, & muliebri ve-*
 " *luntate pro Filii sui Liberazione ac prosperitate nuncquam Regni*
 " *Francorum universitas hoc concedet.* Absit enim ut duodecim
 " *Parium* *Judicium quo justè adjudicatur, & privatur Normannia*
 " *cæsatur, & pro frivolo habeatur.* Nec etiam alia que exigunt
 " *Rex Anglie noſter hoffis Capitalis, nobis superfibribus quomodo*
 " *libet possidebit. Et factum eſt, &c.*

and even with a Sigh : *Et suspirans ait, O uti-
nam, &c.*

Loffy, Here is a Fifth Mistake, *Lewis's Words
I wish to God, &c.* quoted in the Dissertation, are
related as having been written upon the occasi-
on, when *Matt. Paris* says, there was a horrible
murmuring amongst the Great Men. That mur-
muring related to the Embassy sent by the King
of *England*, in pursuance of *Lewis's Order*, whilst
he was in his first Expedition beyond the Seas.
Now that Embassy was in 1252, but it was two
Years after, in 1254, that *Henry* being then the
first time at *Paris*, *Lewis* said to him, *vixit vox,*
" I wish to God the Twelve Peers and all the
Baronage were of my Mind, we should then
be united in an indissoluble Band of Friend-
ship.

The Abbot *de Verter* has thought proper to
stop there, in which he has acted according to
his Condition. This is an Expression used by Fa-
ther *Daniel* to denote his Profession ; but I hope
to be excused if mine obliges me to go on,
where the Author thought fit to break off. The
Truth is, he stopp'd in too fair a way. Our
Quarrels, added *Good St. Lewis*, make the Popes
insolent, and give them an Opportunity to play
the Mad-men, *Discordia nostra fomentum praefat
debacchandi Romanis, & materiam superbendi.* I
have given the Word *debaccari* the same Signifi-
cation as *Madam Dacier* in the First Scene of the
Second Act of the *Adelphi*. If I would have
used a stronger Term, I might have been coun-
tenanced by M. *le Fevre*, that Learned Lady's
Father, who translated these Words of *Terence*,
*Si satis iam debacchatus es, if thou hast play'd
the Devil long enough.* As to the rest, 'tis plain,

St. Lewis could mean no other by the *Romanis*, than the Popes or the Court of *Rome*, which is the same thing. I doubt very much if the Holy Fathers had been acquainted with this Particular, whether he would have ever tasset of the Saintship, (in the Original *l'Apophœse*). And indeed, how scandalous is it, that one who has talk'd in that manner of the Heads of the Church, of the Vicars of Jesus Christ, should nevertheless be canoniz'd. Sure I am, that the Popes have as much Right to take away, as to confer Beatification; so who knows but some of them may by Virtue of their Almighty Power degrade St. Lewis, for having spoken thus freely and disrepectfully of the Holy See! At least, 'twill not be the first time a Pope has repented of having canoniz'd a Person, and even said, That Person did not deserve it. Here is a touch upon this Subject out of *Menagiana*, Page 191. of the *Amsterdam* Edition; “Count d'Ollone used to say, that one of Cardinal *Mazarin's* Stories was, that a Family in *Rome*, of which one had been lately Beatified, having given the Pope some Trouble, he complained, *Questo gente è molto ingrata; io ho beatificato uno de loro Parenti, chi non lo meritava.*” That a Knight of the Holy Ghost should say to a King when he conferred that Order upon him, *Sir, I am not worthy; and that the King should answer, Oh, I know that very well,* as is said of *Henry IV.* is but a laughing Matter: But that a Pope should say, he canoniz'd any one that did not deserve it, in Complaisance to the Family, is the most deplorable thing in the World. How many pretended Saints are there of that Order? Nay, how many are there that never existed? I appeal to Doctor

Doctor

Doctor de Lannoy, that famous discarter of Saints: he has pull'd more Saints out of Paradise, says M. *de Vigneml Martville*, than Ten Popes have made. The Rector of St. *Eustace of Paris*, used to say, Whenever I meet Doctor *de Lannoy*, I make him a Bow to the Ground, and talk to him Cap-in-Hand, and with the greatest Submission, so fearful am I lest he should rob me of my St. *Eustace*, who hangs by a Thread. Vol. r. p. 275.

The Rector's Apprehensions were but too well grounded, for M. *de Valois confesses* St. *Eustace*, to be an *unknown* and a very *suspicious Saint. Valeſiana* p. 48. And speaking of the Eleven Thousand Virgins, says, he cannot conceive how the Doctors of *Sorbonne*, amongst whom there are so many Learned Men, come to suffer that Troop of *Contraband Saints*, to be the Tutelear Patronesses of their Church, p. 49. But why should we divert our selves with jesting upon an Abuse that should draw from us Tears of Blood? Why have not those who are sensible of this, the Glory of God enough at Heart, to cry aloud against so great a Transgression, in order to put an End to it? For our Part, we have but too much reason to say to the *Roman Catholicks*, as our Lord did to the *Samaritan Woman*, *Ye worship ye know not what, we know what we worship.* John 4. 22.

The Paragraph which follows these Three I have just examin'd, and which concludes the Dissertation, is very material; I have elsewhere occasionally quoted some of the last Lines of it; but here I shall insert the whole: " I do not relate this Piece of History of St. *Lewis*, after that of *Froissart*, for any other End than to shew that the Peers and High Barons were not

not only the Interpreters of the *Salick Law*,
and by their Rank always Judges of the
Crown ; but also that they had a Right to
hinder any Province, being alienated from
it, in the same manner as the *Rachinburgs*
were in the First Line of the *French Kings*, ap-
pointed as Guardians and Interpreters of the
Salick Law, to prevent any Portion of the
Salick Lands being given to the Female Sex.
I must own, as I have said already, the Col-
lection of Laws published by our Kings, seems
to have been designed only for regulating the
Succession of Private Families amongst the
Franks and *Salians*; but it must also be allowed,
that a necessary Consequence is to be drawn
in Relation to the whole Kingdom, from these
very Laws ; which being essentially and pure-
ly Salick, conquered by the Head of the *Salis-
ans*, and the most noble and excellent Fief, (if
one may make use of that Expression) of the
Salick Dominions ; the Crown of such a King-
dom, whether by Virtue of the *Salick Law*, or a
more ancient Custom, cannot be hereditary
to any other than the Male Issue alone of the
House Reigning, as the Practice hath been
for near Thirteen Hundred Years.

Tis very much to be doubted, whether this
Position of M. *de Verneor*, That the Peers and High
Barons, in the time of St. *Lewis*, had a Right
of restraining the Alienation of any Province from
the Crown of *France*, will be generally relish'd.
For if they were then possessed of such a Right,
they ought to have it still ; at least, it does
not appear why, or by what means they lost it.
The Consequences of this Proposition are so ea-
sily perceived, that they need no Explanation,
and

and 'tis pretty certain, it would not be universally liked in *France*. 'Tis true, *Francis*, the First, to be rid of the Trearies of *Madrid* and *Cambray*, pretended he had no Power to conclude them, by reason of this Argument advanced in Parliament, by the Advocate-General † *James Cappel*, that the Provinces of the Crown, being unalienable, he had not the Power of yielding the Sovereignty of *Flanders* and *Artois* to *Charles the Fifth*. Nevertheless, if when that Prince had Two Sons living; he had taken it into his head to divide his Dominions between them, and make two distinct Kingdoms, no doubt, he would have pretended the same Right his Predecessors so often put in practice in the First and Second Line. But whatever the Power of the Peers and High Barons might be in *Lewis's* time in this respect, there was no occasion to exert it in the Dispute between him and *Henry III*. For the matter was not about disuniting any Province from the Crown of *France*; but what was very different, restoring to the King of *England* such Provinces as by Right belonged to him, as Fiefs of that Crown. *St. Lewis* knew this in his own Heart; nay, he made no scruple to confess it; and what is more, order'd those Provinces to be restored, as I have shewn a little before.

S 2

The

† Father of *Lewis*, Professor of Divinity at *Sedan*, and by *James* his Elder Son, who was * Counsellor in the Parliament of *Rheims*, Grandfather to *James* and *Lewis*, Professors of Divinity, the First at *Sedan*, and the Other at *Sauvur*.

* Counsellors in the Parliaments of *France* are not Lawyers, as in *England*; they set there as Judges. Those Sovereign Courts are composed of Presidents and Counsellors.

The chief Observation I would make upon *M. de Verter's* last Paragraph, is, that from it, as well as the whole Dissertation, there results two things. First, That every Kingdom has a Right to limit the Succession of the Crown, in such manner as shall be thought proper. *France* has confined it to the Male Issue only; *Portugal* admits both Sexes; but excludes such Princes of the Blood as are not born in the Kingdom, and such Princesses as * marry in a Foreign Countrey. 'Tis in pursuit of this Principle that *Portugal* has shaken off the Yoke of the Kings of *Spain*, descended from *Isabella* of *Portugal*, Mother of *Philip the Second*, and set the House of *Braganca* upon the Throne, which enjoy it at this day. This Right, exercised by the Kingdoms of *France* and *Portugal*, as they thought best, ought to be common to all Nations; every one of them may make such Limitations as they judge most for their Advantage.

The second thing that results from the last Paragraph, and indeed, from the whole Dissertation, is, *That a Crown does not cease to be Hereditary, notwithstanding the Limitations concerning it, may exclude those, who by natural Order of Blood would have had the first Claim, were it not for those Limitations.* Thus the Crown of *France* is Hereditary

* This is called the Law of *Lamego*; because it was enacted in an Assembly of the States held there in the Year 1143. *Du Verrier* recites it in his History of *Spain*, T. 2. P. 387. Sit isti Lex in sempiternum, quod prima filia Regis accipiat maritum de *Portugalle*, ut non veniat Regnum ad extranos, & si casaverit cum Principe estraneo, non sit Regina, quia nungam volumus nostrum Regnum ire fore de *Portugalibus*, quia sua fortitudine Reges fecerunt sine adjutorio alieno, per suam fortitudinem, & cum suo sanguine.

editary, altho' the Princesses who might be next of kin, are excluded from it on account of their Sex. Thus the Crown of *Portugal* is Hereditary, altho' the Princesses who might be next of kin, lose their Right when they marry in a Foreign Country, &c. The Crown of *France* then is no less Hereditary, since the Limitations made concerning it at *Utrecht*, than it was before. So likewise the Crown of *Great Britain* is no less Hereditary since the Limitations concerning it, than it was before. The Crown of *France*, says M. *de Vertot*, cannot be Hereditary, but to the Male Issue alone of the House upon the Throne. By the same Reason, we must say, That the Crown of *Portugal* cannot be Hereditary to any, but such Princes as are born, and such Princesses as are married within the Kingdom; That the Crown of *France* cannot be Hereditary to any but the Princes to whom it is limited by the Treaty of *Utrecht*; That the Crown of *Great Britain* cannot be Hereditary to any, but the Princes and Princesses declared capable of the Succession, by Acts of Parliament made since the Reign of King *James II.*

Thus I end these Remarks; in which, tho' I have been as exact as was possible, it may be, I have fallen into the same Mistakes that I have observed in others, so frequent and common are they. "One must not always fansie (says the Author of the *Method for reading History*, Tom. I. p. 381.) " a Critick has always better succeeded than the Author he writes against; he is often guilty of Faults, whilst he reflects upon those of others." The more I have shewn that some of the most celebrated and valuable Writers have mistaken; so much the more, and the

the rather ought I to stand in fear of the like Reproach ; I, who am so far from having those rare Endowments, that have gain'd them a great and glorious Reputation. If I have happen'd to mistake, I shall be always ready to own it, and by a solemn Retraction, repair the Wrong I may have done any Person, of what Nation or Religion soever he be.

F I N I S.



like
those
great
d' to
and
ng I
on or

!  !

E R R A T A.

PAGE 15. in the Note, Line 2. for *Brother-in-Law*
read *Son-in-Law*; p. 85. l. 2. r. *Sexages*; p. 91. l. 18.
for Vertot *on the contrary*, r. Vertot. *On the contrary*,
p. 92. l. 11, 12. r. *Daughter of Lewis*; p. 97. l. r. for
them r. this; l. ult. r. *the Three French*.



卷之三

